

Paul J. Brown, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

Irvin J. Gershen, a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

James F. Hovey, a citizen of Minnesota.
William S. Brewer, a citizen of New York.
Harris H. Barnes, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.
Archie B. Norford, a citizen of Virginia.
Thomas M. Brown, a citizen of Virginia.
Robert J. McKirnan, a citizen of Ohio.
Philip T. Kujovsky, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

James L. Cullen, a citizen of Ohio.
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.

John E. Shepherd, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

James T. Pearce, a citizen of South Carolina.

LeRoy Bald, a citizen of Maryland.
William L. Dick, a citizen of Washington.
Eugene C. Swift, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Serge S. Gorny, a citizen of Washington.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943:

Robert S. Stubbs II, a citizen of Florida.
James K. Roberts, a citizen of West Virginia.

Platoon Sgt. John P. Sawyer II, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of May 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of May 1943:

Harry B. Persinger, Jr., a citizen of West Virginia.
Robert D. Thurston, a citizen of New Jersey.

James B. Ord, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Louis G. Nickell 3d, a citizen of Arkansas.
Richard F. Ladd, a citizen of Vermont.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1943:

George F. Lewis, a citizen of Kentucky.
Herbert E. Roser, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Wilford L. Stone, a citizen of Iowa.
Frank H. Griffin, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of June 1943:

John B. Green, a citizen of New Jersey.
Maurice S. Dampier, a citizen of Missouri.
Eugene J. Adams, a citizen of California.

Corp. Bidwell C. McClelland, Jr., a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1943:

Benjamin W. Dulany, a citizen of Virginia.
Frederick Knoch, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey.

Benjamin H. Sweney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of July 1943:

Alexander Kositch, a citizen of California.
Warren A. Butcher, a citizen of California.
Donald R. Hall, a citizen of Montana.
Odia "E" Howe, Jr., a citizen of California.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of July 1943:

Paul M. Hupf, a citizen of New York.
Robert A. Heath, a citizen of Indiana.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Hugh C. Kiger, a citizen of North Carolina.

James P. Jacobson, a citizen of South Dakota.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, September 21 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joachim O. Fernandez, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father in Heaven, Creator of the morning and our Guardian through the night, inspire us with the master spirit as we go to the labors of this day. As wickedness infernal is stalking the earth and chaos seething up from its depths, nerve our souls with Christian righteousness and justice. We rejoice that brute forces cannot triumph, because the Lord our God omnipotent reigneth; His hosts of freedom ever face a glorious tomorrow.

Blessed Lord, earth would grow cold without Thy ministrations, hope would die and life be disenchanted. We pray that we may keep the true way, having our thoughts pure and our deeds valiant, giving our faith a new emphasis, opening wells of inner vitality that rise to all eternity. In the name of our Master we pray that we may be clothed with those verities which temper and flame against the encompassing horrors of helpless humanity. Give us strength to watch every stroke and touch on the canvas of our daily lives; thus by our example our countrymen shall know that we are accepting our problems with honor and sacrifice and are determined to achieve the high aims of patriotic citizenship. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM CARLOS SAYAN ALVAREZ, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PERU

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

[Translation]

SEAL OF CONGRESS OF PERU,
Lima, August 18, 1943.

The Honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA:

Engineer Federico Uranga, national representative for Pisco, who is traveling to the United States on a special government commission for the study of earth dams and problems of cooperative organizations, conveys also the greetings of the Peruvian representatives to the honorable Representatives of the United States of North America.

I beg Your Excellency to accept the expressions of cordial friendship which Representative Uranga bears, especially when he refers to our desire that the formidable strength of that great Nation may always serve to main-

tain the principles of justice and right in the world.

I avail myself of this opportunity to offer to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

God guard Your Excellency.

CARLOS SAYAN ALVAREZ,
President, Chamber of
Representatives of Peru.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES HERBERT SINCLAIR

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a clipping from a Fargo, N. Dak., newspaper which announces the death on September 5 last of a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable James Herbert Sinclair.

The older Members will recall that their friend Sinclair was first elected in 1918 as a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress and subsequently was reelected to each succeeding Congress until the Seventy-fourth.

After leaving Congress he remained in Washington and devoted considerable time to efforts to promote Missouri River diversion. He was later appointed a member of the Mexican Claims Commission, on which commission he rendered distinguished service.

Mr. Sinclair had been in failing health for some time prior to his death and was living in Miami, Fla., when the final summons came.

He is survived by his widow and two sons and two daughters, James H. Sinclair, Jr., of Kenmare, N. Dak.; Daniel Sinclair, of Dayton; Mrs. Wesley Bertelson, of La Crosse, Wis.; and Mrs. Harold Hannah, Cut Bank, Mont. He also leaves a sister, Miss Edith Sinclair, of Los Angeles, and a brother, W. D. Sinclair, of Hannaford, N. Dak.

Mr. Sinclair was born near St. Mary, Ontario, Canada, on October 9, 1871, and went to North Dakota Territory with his parents in 1883.

Those of us who remember his valiant championing of the causes nearest his heart, his untiring devotion to the interests of his constituency, and the distinction which attended each and every act of his as a Member of Congress join with the people of his State and with his family to mourn his passing.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 of this month death claimed the Honorable James H. Sinclair, a former Member of this House from North Dakota. He was elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress and every succeeding Congress for 16 years.

He was my opponent in both the primary and general elections of 1934, but during those campaigns in referring to him I had nothing to say that was not complimentary.

James H. Sinclair was born at St. Mary, Ontario, Canada, October 9, 1871, and was therefore in his seventy-second year when he passed away. He was a

good man; honest, courageous. He also had another excellent quality that unfortunately is not possessed by all. He was thoughtful of others and would never advance his own interests if by doing so he knew it would injure someone else.

From 1935 he served on the Mexican Claims Commission by appointment by President Roosevelt.

It is unnecessary for me to recall to you older Members his service here in the House—you served with him during those many years, you knew him. To know him intimately, as you knew him, is to speak his praise.

North Dakota and the Nation have lost a truly outstanding citizen.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, indelibly filed away in the innermost recesses of the human mind there are records of former days and happy recollections which, though long forgotten, or seldom recalled, spring to life and memory in all their pristine clearness and beauty at the mention of a name or a glance at a printed page.

So, to all who knew him in the busy and useful days of his long and distinguished service in this Chamber the sad tidings of the passing of Jim Sinclair brings vividly to mind his many admirable traits of character and many pleasant associations with him in committee and on the floor.

He served on the Committee on Appropriations and was one of the most active and valuable members of the committee in a particularly critical period. Throughout his congressional career he rendered exceptional service to his constituency and his country. Few men have left so enviable a record in the annals of the House.

The day is just a little darker, the road is just a little steeper and the burden just a little heavier, knowing that he is gone.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to hear of the death of Hon. James H. Sinclair, of North Dakota. He was a very able and forceful Member of this House and served here for many years.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations he was diligent, faithful, and always had in mind the interests of his State and his country. I have never known a Member who tried more persistently and more earnestly to serve his people. He will be greatly missed by all of those who came in contact with him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two resolutions, one offered by the distinguished Governor of New York State, Mr. Dewey, with reference to the Polish celebration and another offered by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, at an international meeting held on August 19, 1943. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions were sent to me by Mr. Tuszynski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the T. V. A. yardstick and to include therein some excerpts from the report of the Electric Power Board of the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., together with some tables I have had compiled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the Prairie Farmer, published in my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a telegram from some of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next at the conclusion of the regular business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address I delivered before the Rotary Club in Chicago, and also to include a letter written to Mr. Fred M. Vinson, Stabilization Director.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, on the labor record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article written by Ed A. Nowack, published in the Michigan Digest. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will require two and two-thirds pages of the Record at a cost of \$120.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein two speeches delivered at the Arkansas Flood Control Commission meeting at Fort Smith, Ark., on September 2. They will consume more than the allotted amount of space in the Record and the Government Printing Office advises that the cost will be \$225.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include in my remarks a manuscript entitled "Planning for Liberty," the cost of which will be \$495.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by our majority leader before the 1943 national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at Boston on August 16; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein two editorials concerning our former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter received from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Lucian W. Shaw, a tax authority, on the renegotiation of contracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Army and Navy Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a speech by Mr. Clayton Rand before the Rotary Club of Gulfport, Miss., on The New Deal and Diocletian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a former distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable John O'Connor, on the subject of the President's recent diatribe against Congress for seeking to dispense with the services of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today and also tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD PEACE

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 25.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally understood by statesmen everywhere that national foreign policy primarily seeks to forward the welfare of the nation adopting that policy. No doubt when Mr. Churchill approaches the problem as to whether or not Great Britain will enter into an international cooperative effort to establish and maintain peace he will first consider the interests of Great Britain; and when Mr. Stalin considers that problem, he will no doubt consider the interests of Russia. Likewise, when the Generalissimo of China considers that great problem, he will look first to the interests of China; and the Congress in the consideration of this resolution should look first to the interests of the United States.

I have decided myself to support the Fulbright resolution upon the ground that it is to the best interests of the United States to pass the resolution. I have come to that conclusion upon the basis of evidence. And what is that evidence? We all know that war is the curse of mankind. That has been proven to us time and time again, and every page in history testifies to that fact. We know that during the last 25 years we have had two world wars. We know that we depended upon our neutral rights and international law to preserve

our neutrality during the first war, and we know that the people of the United States wanted to stay out of the First World War. However, notwithstanding that, we became involved. We know that thousands of youths of this land were killed on the battlefields of Europe and elsewhere.

We know that billions of the dollars of the taxpayers' money was spent that victory might be won in that war. Victory was won, and we turned to the problem of trying to evolve some plan to keep a world war from recurring. I do not intend to discuss here why those plans failed—why we did not enter into some form of cooperation in order that another world war might not come about; but that happened. We did not enter into world organization to preserve the peace. It was not entirely our fault; it was not entirely the fault of Great Britain, nor the fault of any other nation, but it was a combination of all of the faults of all the nations of the earth, each looking after its own selfish interests and not considering that a peaceful world would be for the best interests of each individual nation, in addition to being to the best interests of the world at large. So we went along for about 20 or 25 years, again depending upon international law to preserve peace, and this Congress decided to supplement international law by the passage of several neutrality acts, acts to circumscribe the rights of our own citizens in connection with their dealings and operations with foreign nations, and even some of the national rights of our citizens, because we felt it was worth paying that price to secure peace. We passed those neutrality laws, and the world went to war again, but the United States was out of it. Things moved along and this thing and that came up until the Congress decided that it should pass amendments to the neutrality law, and ended in finally repealing the neutrality laws. We then went back to nothing but international law in our efforts to preserve peace for the United States, but international law failed. Why? Because it was not backed up by force, or power to enforce its decrees. So now we are in the greatest war history has ever known. Only last year this Congress appropriated more of the taxpayers' money for the prosecution of this war than had ever been appropriated by the United States Congress from the time of George Washington until the end of the First World War, and today on all battlefields American boys are laying down their lives that victory may be secured for us. We know what is happening today, and what has happened in the past, and we know the future can be judged only by the past. So what are we going to do about it? Are we going to depend upon the reeds in the wind that failed us before? Or are we going to try to evolve some new means and blaze new paths in order that the scourge of mankind may never again visit this earth in the form that it is visiting it now? Some say that the lower House of Congress has nothing to do with this problem.

It is true, I admit, that, according to the Constitution of the United States, the power to ratify treaties rests in the Senate of the United States. But there is nothing in the law of the land, nothing in the Constitution that prohibits the lower House of Congress from asserting its views on this vital question.

Today we are considering the question of whether or not we will cooperate after this war with the other nations of the world to establish and maintain a joint organization with the purpose of preserving lasting peace. The Congress may not have the right to make agreements with foreign nations, but the Congress has had to deal with foreign nations. We only have to remember that we passed several neutrality acts to isolate ourselves from the machinations of foreign nations. I do not hesitate to say that I voted for those acts because I thought at that time they were for the best interests of the United States. But I have been disillusioned. This war has come. We are in it for better or worse. I reiterate that the question that should be uppermost in our minds today in consideration of this resolution is whether or not the Congress should take the responsibility of expressing to the world its united opinion that this great Government is willing to embark on new seas in its effort to preserve the peace in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Some here have said that this House has no say-so as to the preservation of the peace after this war. Well, this House has had plenty to do with preparing this Nation for war and providing funds for the prosecution of the war. This House voted to declare war. This House voted to conscript the men and boys of our country to fight our battles.

We put rifles on their shoulders and sent them to foreign fields to die there. Why then should not this Congress express its opinion in regard to the prevention of future wars?

After this world war is over we will even vote to appropriate some money to build a monument over there in Arlington Cemetery and inscribe the words on that monument: "Here lies in honored glory another American soldier, known but to God."

It is my belief that could the American soldier speak who lies over there now, a hero of the last war, he would say to us today that he would much rather that we erect as a memorial to him a solidified effort on the part of the United States to sponsor some form of cooperative international organization in order that this outrage on humanity will never happen again.

This Congress is blazing new trails today. No such resolution has ever been presented here before. But the daring must blaze new trails, and the Congress of the United States should lead in the blazing of this particular trail.

The old saying, "He either fears his fate too much, or his deserts are small, that dares not put it to the touch to win or lose it all," applies to the Congress of the United States and to nations everywhere as it does to individuals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, after having listened to the arguments pro and con on the Fulbright resolution as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I favor its passage because I believe it is in the right direction toward the formulation of plans for a permanent and lasting peace. In my opinion it is a definite step toward the elimination of future conflicts, which is certainly foremost in the thoughts of every American citizen.

During my recent stay at home with the people of my district, they emphasized to me that the steps such as are planned through this resolution are right and they are wholly in accord with my vote on this momentous legislation. They also are of the opinion that we should collaborate with other countries of peace-loving people, and by doing so thus strive to eliminate any cause for discord in the future.

It is the desire of every American, as well as all the people of the world, to look forward to permanent peace and a better place for the present and future generations to live in, that the valor and sacrifices of our men in arms in the present war shall not have been in vain.

On the passage of this resolution I am of the belief that this will fulfill the wish and desire of every man and woman and, through its provisions, will establish a key to stop any future futile aggressions that are so devastating to the civilization of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the subject at hand, I quote the pending resolution as now proposed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

While this resolution contemplates peace among all the nations of the world and would, therefore, bless all peoples everywhere, the consideration that it is designed to bless our own people and to save them from the horrors of another or other wars is not to be forgotten; and he who would be so narrow and selfish as to deny these blessings to our own country because other nations and peoples may be likewise benefited and saved can hardly claim to be America's best friend and therefore an American first.

It has surely been demonstrated that our refusal to help secure the peace of the world will not contribute to the peace or security of our own Nation. It is written, "No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself."

The light that shines farthest shines brightest nearer home.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, commits us to seek peace at home and peace abroad; these being shown to be inseparable.

As an American first but with a concern for the welfare and peace of the world I shall gladly support this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Fulbright resolution today, I do so as I feel it is the necessary and logical first chapter of a charter of peace. It is the starting point from which the Congress and the Executive, together, can go on to establish the basic requirements for international peace.

I think the fact is well established by history, by our own experience within the last 25 years, to prove that without international cooperation we cannot hope for lasting peace. Otherwise we must follow in the same old paths that have always led to war.

In passing this resolution today, the Congress is merely catching up with the thinking of the people of this Nation. They are for international cooperation and are determined that we do not again fumble the chance for peace after World War No. 2. By its passage, we will assure our own people and those of other lands that we in Congress do not intend to repeat the tragic mistakes of World War No. 1.

By our agreement today on the question of international cooperation, we will have arrived at the point where the Congress, if it chooses to aid the Executive, then can limit and specify the particulars necessary for the outline of an enforceable and an enduring peace. Without this agreement now, the discussion of the mechanics and the organization is futile.

I am anxious for the House of Representatives to speak on this vital issue. Foreign policy, after all, broken down to its real meaning, means national security. I am unwilling to surrender to 33 Members of the Senate, one-third of that body, the life or death veto over the security of future generations of Americans.

After the passage of this resolution, I feel it is the duty of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to consider other and more specific plans to make possible the bringing about of the objectives of this resolution. The American people are for this ideal and they wait on their Congress for us to provide the minimum specifics of such an international organization. It is true that they want no superstate. But they do want a good neighborhood of nations and they feel that it is not asking too much of their elected representatives for us to try to work out such a plan.

I disagree completely with those who say that we ought to wait until the war is won before we discuss the ways and means for peace. It would be just as idiotic for us to wait—as it would have been for the admirals and the generals to wait until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor before making plans on how to fight a war. If we are to avoid those tragic words of "too little and too late" at the peace table, it is high time that the Congress acts, not only on this resolution, but on others to follow.

By taking action now we can tell the rest of the world and particularly those who suffer under Nazi aggression that this time the United States will not withdraw after the fighting and permit the peace to be lost by lesser nations or lesser statesmen. We can make a real contribution to military success by our affirmative action now. We can remove, by acting now, this vital question of national security from the arena of partisan politics into which it would drift by next year. We can also provide, while the common danger of 80 percent of the civilized world holds us together as United Nations, the framework of judicial machinery for adjusting the myriad disputes that are bound to grow out of the transition of the world from war to peace. Those problems will be on the doorstep with the armistice whether we have international cooperation or not. And you had better have the means for the peaceful arbitration of them available before the magnitude of the problems stare you in the face.

I believe the House is wise in taking affirmative action on the Fulbright resolution today. I hope then, with its passage, that the Foreign Affairs Committee will consider some such resolution as S. 114, by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL, to work out the limited and specific authority necessary and to provide a framework within which an enduring peace can be secured.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of this Nation, through its Congress, making definite commitments now which might weaken or embarrass us in dealing with the questions which will inevitably arise as a result of the present world conflict.

I am not fully advised as to the motives inspiring consideration of this resolution at this particular time but certainly its terms are so broad and general that I cannot construe it as any such commitment.

Machinery under this resolution in order to be appropriate must contain the essential elements of ample wisdom and unselfish singleness of purpose in addition to power and it is difficult to visualize the creation of such perfectly balanced machinery by any agency other than the Divine Creator Himself. I consider, therefore, that this body in approving this resolution is only reaffirming in a general way its faith in the Christian ideals upon which our civilization is founded, and I am voting for its adoption.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, if a piece of legislation was ever presented to this House which has resulted in a disease among the Members best diagnosed as a "diarrhea of words and constipation of the brain," this Fulbright resolution is it.

Many of the supposed intellectuals of the House have spewed words by the hundreds, condemning and openly admitting that it is fallacious and in reality only a mirage. In other words, they are alibiing and making excuses for voting to accept the resolution.

One respected and distinguished Member, who is certainly old enough to have his feet on the ground, very rightly asserted, "I cannot get it, to save my life, why we are now engaged in a discussion of a thing which everybody says will have no effect on the immediate winning of the war or can bind our judgment or influence our attitude when the time for action comes." Within a very few minutes, he went into a tail spin and openly made an about face. "A wise man changes his mind; a fool never," you say. Well, in my opinion, it was a "foolbright" resolution that caused this wise man to about face and not any merits of the Fulbright measure.

What did the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] say on the floor yesterday? And I quote:

If this resolution is adopted, the Executive can negotiate as to details with assurance that the people are willing to support any reasonable system of collective security.

What is reasonable collectivism? We have seen it foisted upon the American people in many forms during the past few years in this country. To those doing the foisting, it no doubt seems reasonable, but to those who are being foisted upon, it seems anything but reasonable.

Peace and cooperation with the nations of the earth, certainly; but how in the name of sanity can we be engaged in total war, teaching our young men to hate and to kill, with an olive branch held between their teeth? We as human beings cannot react rationally when two great emotions are surging within us at one and the same time. First, win the war and then, with hatred and killing banished from our hearts and our thinking, sit down with the one emotion of brotherly love and cooperation in our hearts and work out a permanent peace for all the world.

One Member has said that there can be no peace without America participating and I heartily agree, but neither can there be a global war without our help, and if we had been strong internally and had not been so anxious to furnish the munitions of war to countries which we knew were preparing for war, just for the sake of amassing fortunes in this country, we would not be at war today.

But regardless of whether we went around with a chip on our shoulders daring someone to knock it off, we are at war and must and will win at all

costs. But in the name of common sense, let us stick to the two immediate problems before us now. First, win the war; and secondly, do our utmost to save the home front, and then, when this has been accomplished, lend our efforts to the program of working out a better and more permanent civilization, and let us not waste 2 days of our time and the taxpayers' money considering "foolbright resolutions" which will have no more effect on determining the peace which England will demand and Russia will get, than these remarks of mine will have.

What we need in America is another member of the President's Cabinet designated as the secretary of peace, just as well as a Secretary of War.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the floor of the House, the question was asked why we should consider the Fulbright resolution now before the war is won. The answer it seems to me is obvious. Our post-war policies are now being formulated. The issue is already on our doorstep. The administration is not waiting until the war is won but is determining our post-war policies almost daily.

Let us examine the record. We have already had a refugee conference in Bermuda. Do you or I know what commitments were made at that conference? No. They are so secret they are not to be imparted even to the members of your Foreign Affairs Committee although the chairman was the delegate to that conference from the House.

We all recall the food conference which was held just before the Congress recessed. The sessions were secret and the press and Members of Congress were barred. What commitments were made there or post-war promises? Who knows? Do you as Members of Congress know? Is it not high time we begin now to take an interest in post-war policies? If we do not we will wake up one of these days and find our course of action in post-war matters has already been determined for us without any initial approval of the Congress. We will find commitments have been made and the only time we will be consulted concerning them is when we are asked to appropriate money for the administration of the international agencies and to carry out their purpose.

Let me point out a specific example which is in the process of being carried out right now. On June 10 the State Department gave out a press release that there was soon to be called, probably the last of September or early in October, a rehabilitation conference of the United Nations. The original draft, which I understand is now being changed, provided for each country to send a delegate to this international council. There was to be a central committee composed of Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States, and an international director. This central committee and the international director were evidently going to be the "big shots" of the organiza-

tion. Whether this met with objections from the smaller countries I do not know but at least the original draft is in the process of being changed.

Incidentally there was to be a committee for Europe and a committee for Asia. Since we are not geographically a part of these areas it might well be we would not be a member of these subcommittees. But there was to be created another committee upon which you can bet your bottom dollar we will be well represented, and that is the committee on supplies. We will be counted on to do our full share even in the face of rationing which is almost certain to be continued long after the war.

Apparently the powers that be decided it was necessary to soften up our people to such a program, so through the O. W. I. there was an appeal made to the radio industry to assist in such a program. The appeal was very subtle. They were asked to publicize the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, which was about the middle of August. But in making this request of the radio industry the O. W. I. did not confine itself to calling attention to the actual contents of the Atlantic Charter but proceeded to give its own unwarranted interpretation of it. This in spite of the fact we all know the sole function of the O. W. I. is to furnish the American people with the true, unvarnished facts.

The O. W. I. stated in substance that in the Atlantic Charter we had guaranteed the world should be free from want, and the time had now come when we should set up the international institutions to carry out these economic promises. They also stated the Atlantic Charter had been formally ratified by the United Nations. We all know the Congress has never approved the Atlantic Charter, or in any way been called on to carry out its provisions. The same is true of foreign countries. Take the case of Russia. Maxim Litvinov agreed to the terms of the Atlantic Charter for Russia and he has now been recalled. Whether his action is still approved is a question.

Fulton Lewis called attention to these facts in a most forceful manner in a recent radio broadcast, and proved conclusively there was no promise or guaranty on our part that the world should be free from want in the Atlantic Charter, nor was it formally ratified by the United Nations.

But is it not significant just before a rehabilitation conference the O. W. I. is attempting to sell our people the erroneous idea we guaranteed and promised the people of the world they should be free from want in the Atlantic Charter? More so because the extent of our participation in such a rehabilitation conference is to be determined without the initial approval of Congress, and its only duty apparently will be to provide the necessary funds to carry out the program.

There is also being formulated right now a plan for post-war stabilization of international credit.

There is also being considered the removal of international trade barriers under section VII of every master agreement we have entered into under Lend-Lease.

There has been set up a committee composed of a number of assistant secretaries of the Cabinet to plan for post-war aviation.

There are also those in high place who right now would like to see our country join a super world government, and transform the world into a glorified W. P. A. Has not the time arrived when we should begin to beware of the kind of a man who is "a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own."

Under these circumstances, how can the Congress sit back and say, "Wait until the war is over before we start doing anything about post-war planning"? We, the Congress, are not leading the parade. It is passing us by.

Is your Foreign Affairs Committee being asked to approve bills requesting authorization of Congress to join these international agencies? Are we asked to what extent we should participate in a rehabilitation program? All we will be told some day is that certain commitments and promises to foreign governments have been made, and it would be most embarrassing and undesirable for Congress not to make the necessary appropriations to carry out the promises in which Congress had no voice of approval or dissent.

Was not that exactly what happened in the recent Panama Canal bill? Did not the State Department go ahead and make an executive agreement with the Republic of Panama to cancel a loan and give her certain property belonging to the United States, amounting in all to over \$12,000,000? Were we asked to approve this action before it had been agreed on? No. We were told the agreements were made and it would be most embarrassing in the midst of a war, and with Panama cooperating so sincerely, not to approve the action taken by the State Department.

Do not you think it is about time we take an interest in post-war problems by passing the Fulbright resolution, and also insist that the Congress not be bypassed in post-war planning?

I am fully aware of the prerogatives of the Chief Executive in foreign affairs, and of the Senate in confirming treaties. I am not suggesting we Members of the House should trespass on these prerogatives, but I am urging the closest cooperation between the Chief Executive, the State Department, and Congress so that these proposed post-war commitments, wherever feasible, will have the approval or disapproval of the appropriate legislative body before commitments are made, and that we not be asked only to appropriate the necessary funds to make these commitments an accomplished fact.

Perhaps I am too hopeful this can be accomplished, but if I am it is all the more reason why we should insist it be done.

We all realize what happened after the last war. A certain course of action was proposed which never received the approval of the Senate. We all know the result. Let us not make that mistake again. This time we should insist on a united front by threshing out our differences ahead of time on post-war policy and formulate a policy on which the vast majority can agree and which will preserve the best interests of the Republic by establishing a just and lasting peace.

By passing the Fulbright resolution we can serve notice on the world that it is at least our intention to bring about such a peace.

We all realize how delicate foreign relations are in the midst of a war. It is easy to wonder whether this nation or that nation is doing her full part, or will continue to do so after the war. Let us at least declare we are willing to try to do our part now. Whether this will be helpful to the Allied cause is best answered by a question I asked Mr. Edward R. Murrow, European representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee when he returned to this country in June. At that time I asked him how the passage of the Fulbright resolution would be received in England and if he thought it would be helpful? He said:

Well, sir, it would be more than that, and not only in England. There isn't anyone in England now who any longer has any doubts we are going to win this war. There are people not only in England but on the Continent as well who have serious doubts as to our will and determination to win the peace. But this would serve to remove most of those doubts in England and particularly the people who come from the Continent; I do not think anyone who has failed to talk to those people can appreciate the extent to which American policy dominates their hopes and their aspirations and it would give them encouragement and hope. I am not presuming to pass any judgment on the bill. I am only reporting what its effect would be.

What we all are interested in is not only to realize our responsibility to the world in attempting to secure a just and lasting peace but even more important to realize our responsibility to the people of the United States and the future of our country. We all want complete victory and a secure peace. But we want also a secure United States of America, a sovereign nation with its constitutional form of government, and our American way of life preserved and maintained.

It is my hope we can have both—a just and lasting peace and still keep America American.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to vote against the Fulbright resolution that Congress favor the setting up of international machinery with power to establish and maintain peace among the nations of the world.

It seems to me the lower House is attempting here to perform a function which does not properly belong to it.

The subject matter of this resolution deals specifically with treaties. The Constitution definitely vests in the President the "power to make treaties," but only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." I think this is sufficient reason for voting against this resolution.

The phrase in the Fulbright resolution, "international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain * * * peace among the nations of the world * * * participation by the United States therein," can mean but one thing, namely, creation of an international police force, with the United States participating, for maintaining an armed peace among the nations of the world. In my opinion, this is no time for the United States to be making any such commitments as this. There are entirely too many unknown factors at this juncture to safely undertake the formulation of so far-reaching and revolutionary a policy as this would involve.

Moreover, those of us who take the position that the peace treaty should be made in strict conformity with the Constitution can hardly be consistent when at the same time we vote for the Fulbright resolution. It would be wholly incongruous to attempt to stand on constitutionalism in the writing of the peace, on the one hand, and to vote for the Fulbright resolution, on the other, since this resolution seeks to perform a duty which the Constitution vests exclusively in the upper Chamber.

It may be expected the Senate will uphold its constitutional prerogative.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution so ably considered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee is well conceived and carefully composed. To agree with its objective, to favor its purpose is easy. Is it possible there could be a Member of the Congress opposed to lasting peace? To place this idealistic conception in practical operation is the job that is difficult. When the time comes that will require greatness.

But here, now, we are not concerned with details of this later most complex task. Here we are concerned with an expression of general policy.

Is it not possible for us here to place our eyes on the sights and aim at the objective of lasting peace, and somehow conceive the beam on which we must fly to reach this goal? Certainly we can try. The beam we must travel, the method we must use, the final action we take are considerations of tremendous importance to our country; upon the paths chosen, the beams followed, will America stand as the greatest power in the world or stand as an average power subjected to the will of more powerful nations or combination of nations? Power is never static; it is either increasing or decreasing.

Ten million men and women are now fighting the battle for America. Upon them and them alone rests the final decision as to whether the action we express today can have any meaning at all. They are fighting, they are not talking. They are dying and willing to die for the America they believe in.

It is what they believe in, and believe in so strongly, that is tremendously important. It is the America they want. The world order they desire, the place of America in the world of the future they are fighting for, that must be considered. Before this Congress or any Congress or any representative of this Government can justly bind this America of ours to any details of plans or methods involving the future these factors must be known.

I believe the views of the organized fighting men and women of this country must be heard and most carefully considered.

That privilege is their right. Details therefore necessarily must be left to a later day. The ideal expressed in the Fulbright resolution is in the right direction.

It was dreams and ideals which brought about the discovery of America.

It was dreams and ideals that brought the early settlers to America. It was dreams and ideals that brought about a free America. It was the dreams and ideals of a little group of Americans who wrought the pattern of a free American Government, which has been the wonder and envy of the entire world.

It is the ideals and dreams and high honor of the men and women in our services that give them the strength and courage to lay down their very lives that American freedom may live.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the press reported that the vote taken on the resolution which was considered yesterday was indicative of what would happen on the pending resolution. I have some different ideas about the resolution we discussed yesterday and I am frank to admit to this body and to others that I was one of those who are recorded among the 23 because I wanted to avail myself of the opportunity to protest against this manner of consideration of the most important problem before the American people and before the world. I have been out on the hustings this summer exhorting my people to think, to talk, to discuss peace and peace proposals. I have asked them to discuss it freely. Then we return here to be confronted with the rather astonishing situation that we should vote to bind our own hands, to shackle our own voices for a period of 4 hours on the most important problem before the world. It was said here yesterday that we must not let the people down. It occurs to me that that is letting the people down. It is said that we should trust the people. I thoroughly agree. But we begin by distrusting each other as this method of consideration indicates because it is im-

possible to amend or alter the pending resolution in any way whatsoever to make it more expressive. The first value of a resolution of this kind is in the discussions that go with the explorations which this body can make. There must be preparation for peace as well as of peace, and through discussion here we make preparation for peace and give opportunity for public thinking to congeal.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] remarked yesterday that this might not be in the interest of unity because there are hundreds of propagandizing organizations in the country today. How else offset them except by the voice of this body and to indicate at length and through fullest discussion what notions we entertain and what course we believe ought to be followed?

Congress invites public reproach by such hasty action as this. It will be a case of 4 hours' discussion in the House and 4 months in the Senate. How can such action be defended in a deliberative body?

That is just the reason that I protested. And I see in this that we are going to have to fight for peace and that enduring peace is going to have much to endure before we get through.

The point that will be belabored here and has been belabored here on yesterday, in my judgment, needed no belaboring. I think the people are generally sold on the idea that we have to collaborate with other nations of the earth. We must collaborate on a practical basis. We must do our full share in the cause of lasting peace. The idea of cooperation needs no emphasis. It is the method and approach which count now. The time has come to spell out in greater detail what we propose to do. There is the oft-repeated phrase that everything will be so different at the end of the war and that nothing can be done now. I disagree. The world, its people and the fundamental questions to be settled will not differ greatly from what we can now see. Then why not a more realistic approach now to avoid differences, misunderstandings, and quarrels in the days to come?

I am a little distressed with what I call this nebular way in which we write resolutions. When I came back from Mackinac and landed in Chicago I picked up the morning papers. No two editorials agreed on what we did. One editorial said:

A conspiracy nailed at Mackinac.

Another editorial said:

Republicans travel in the middle of the wrong road.

A third editorial said:

Republicans pass the customary resolution.

I thought I had a pretty fair idea when I came back of what we had done and I spelled it out to the editors in my own district and tried to make it clear—the very nub of the resolution—in which our good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] so well collaborated and did such a fine job and I stood with him on it.

The time is here for us to make it abundantly clear what we propose to do and what we intend. Think of the scores of questions which have been asked on this floor as to what this resolution means. I favor saying something purposeful and definite even though it be wrong.

We have got to make it clear to the people what we are going to do. We are not doing it. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said yesterday that some people think this goes too far, others think it is innocuous, and therefore it must be a middle-of-the-road course. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] said yesterday that it was a declaration favoring machinery with adequate power, and that it might mean military power in the future. I am ready to embrace the doctrine of force if necessary, but why not say so to the people instead of keeping them in a state of suspense and then having them wonder what the Congress really did? Is it not time that we spell out our intent so that all will know what we mean? The faith and confidence of the people is the only rock upon which we can stand.

The time has come to speak; it will be too late to speak when the Russians are in Berlin because the day for understanding will have passed. I am ready now for a declaration of peace aims because I do not want to see happen what happened after the last war. Yet, how can public sentiment be tested on such a proposition? Congress has deliberately gagged itself and cannot speak.

It was not the Senate, it was the fact that the people had no chance to be prepared that occasioned our difficulties a generation ago and so the peacemakers became the prisoners of public opinion. They will be in the same fix again unless we make clear what we are saying today. So I do not go along with this opinion that it means nothing, that all people can stand on this document. The time has come to say something, and I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I am in his corner on that score.

I favor collaboration, organized justice, the curbing and prevention of military aggression, the disarmament of Axis Powers, a clarification of peace aims now before it is too late, a strong United States Army and Navy, the use of constitutional processes, and the preservation of our national interests. Why not say so in language that all can understand? Must language be used to obscure rather than reveal our intent? Peace will come from the bottom up, not from the top down and the time is here to let the people know what we mean that they might speak their minds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I take sufficient time to ask the gentleman from Illinois how he is going to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am going to vote for the resolution. I would rather go further than that, but I cannot help myself since there is no opportunity under

the procedure employed to offer any amendment or suggestion.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the action the Congress will take today will be important. I certainly cannot agree with him however when he put before this House the proposition that we ought at this time to start discussing all of the details of the coming peace—and that is what I believe he wants to put forward. In fact, he wants to discuss—I think he said—a blueprint of what our aspirations should be, what we should demand, what we should give other nations and how we should go about starting to make the peace immediately. I certainly do not think this is the time for Congress to start blueprinting the peace.

Mr. Speaker, the House by action which it is going to take today will, I hope, take the first step in a continuing line of steps in the process of making contributions toward the future peace of the world. This day may, in fact, become a historic one; insofar as I am able to learn, this branch of the Congress has never before taken similar action. We are saying to our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, and to all others in the armed services, to the people of this country, as well as to the peoples of all the world, that it is the heart and spirit of the Members of this body that there shall never again be a time such as the one we are now passing through. We further say that we believe it is possible to prevent a recurrence of the present tragedy.

Our first and immediate task, of course, is the defeat of those evil forces which have thrust this horror upon the world. In this task, no one will deny that our country is contributing a heroic share—perhaps even playing the decisive role.

Now that the signs point along the road to eventual victory, of almost as great, if not as great, importance is the task, and I should say the immediate task, of beginning to lay the ground work for that peaceful world for which we all fervently hope. I know of no better way to make a beginning than by a declaration that this great Nation desires to collaborate and cooperate with all other nations of similar good will and good intentions to the end that that goal may be achieved.

I cannot agree with the proposal of some distinguished Members that this country should sit back and do nothing whatever until the war is over. Should this advice be followed, upon the signing of an armistice, the world would be confronted with indescribable chaos thrust upon it without any thought or preparation having been made for the preservation of temporary order, and many portions of the world would be confronted with all the horrors of anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, we in America like to say that the United States is the most powerful and leading nation of the world. Leadership does not come from power alone, but power nearly always comes from leadership. This great Nation is in duty bound, because of its position in the

affairs of the world at this time, to take upon itself leadership in the great and noble task of attempting to bring about such a spirit of collaboration, good will, and security among the nations so that each individual, serene in mind and soul, can pursue peaceful pursuits, undisturbed by thoughts of hated and impending wars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting an editorial on the United States foreign policy by Mr. Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, as some who have spoken have stated, that this is a trifling thing we are doing here today. It is of extreme importance, perhaps the most important vote that we may cast in this Congress, because we are asserting our fundamental foreign policy for the future. I think it wise that this should be initiated in the House of Representatives because the House has been traditionally closer to the people than any other agency of government. This step should be taken now because after the war the comradeship which the United Nations have found in fighting together may well be dissipated and after the war we may also find a situation in which if we have not taken action ourselves, the other nations will ally against us. It is important also that the United States rather than the other nations initiate this program for two reasons:

One is largely historic. The nations of Europe are by their geographic position closely intertwined in their destinies. For them, unlike ourselves, the choice is not between isolationism or participation in an association of nations. Their only choice is an alliance between several nations based upon power politics or an association of all the nations. Without America, this association will be impossible. Our choice, on the other hand, is between isolation and association.

Our traditional foreign policy of isolationism served us well until the turn of the century. Now we realize it is out of date and no longer serves our best interests. However, it is well to tell the nations of the world, and we should take the initiative in doing this, that we have abandoned this policy and have decided that the best policy for us in the future in order to protect our national interest is to combine with the other nations of the world in the hope that we may be able to prevent future world wars.

The other reason we should initiate this program of participation is consti-

tutional, and is due to the division of power as to treaties between the President and Congress which is characteristic of our Government. Congress should lay down the broad policies which the President may follow in negotiations. This will afford some guaranty of a sympathetic reception by Congress when it passes upon the finished product. Neither England with its parliamentary government, nor Russia with its autocracy, need any guidance by their legislatures, because neither must submit a peace treaty to its legislature for ratification.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of the House, I have given this resolution and its ramifications serious and prolonged thought. I have listened carefully and intently to the debate here yesterday and today. I have discussed the matter off the floor with many of my colleagues and with intelligent citizens in my district and elsewhere. From this consideration of the question a few things stand out clear:

Every rational person in this country wants to make sure, if it is humanly possible, that we shall have an enduring peace after this war is won. Most persons think the United States made a serious mistake in not cooperating, in some manner, with the other nations of the world in safeguarding peace after the First World War, though I do not think anyone can say with certainty that a majority of the people of the country favored our participation in the League of Nations at the time that question was up for determination. This time, the people do not want to take any chance on having a similar mistake made. They definitely and, I think, almost unanimously favor some sort of an international system that will prevent another outbreak of hostilities for as long a period as we can safeguard against it.

In seeking to achieve this devoutly desired goal, however, I am absolutely positive that our loyal and patriotic American men and women, who love and cherish our form of Government and way of life, and who have enjoyed so many blessings of all kinds under our Constitution and democratic institutions, are not willing to surrender any of our national sovereignty nor submit to any impingement of our exclusive control of our domestic affairs. They believe, and rightly so, that we in America can cooperate with other peoples throughout the world in setting up peace machinery that will function efficiently and successfully without yielding to any of the other peoples any right to dictate or determine how we shall operate our own exclusively governmental machinery.

The very delicacy of the problem involved, and the time and thought that are necessary, in designing and building the international machinery that will be capable of establishing and maintaining a fair and just peace, constitute the motivating force behind the present desire to set in motion before the war is over the effort to effect a harmonious under-

standing between the 32 United Nations that will be reflected in the treaties and covenants to be written at the peace conference. Our people do not think that we can afford to wait until the war is over and the delegates take their seats at the peace table to begin to talk about the kind of peace we are going to have. They think it is imperative that we proceed without delay to weigh and determine the problems involved and seek to devise solutions that can be incorporated in formal agreements when the time comes.

That brings us to the resolution before the House today. It embodies the wish of virtually all of our people that the United States say to the world that we are as determined to win the peace as we are to destroy the Axis aggressors. It is an expression of the sentiment of the Congress that the work of peace should be begun while the task of victory is in the process of accomplishment.

But it would be a gross violation of the people's wishes to say that there is any purpose to clothe anybody with blanket authority to establish peace machinery other than through and in strict accordance with the provisions and restrictions of the Constitution. It merely says to those who will represent the United States at the peace conference that we want a lasting peace, and we realize this will require the participation of the United States in its establishment and maintenance, but that Congress still must have its constitutional part in the framing of the terms, and whatever they do must be brought back to Congress, either to the Senate in the form of a treaty or treaties or to both Houses in the form of a concurrent resolution or resolutions. If anyone undertakes to interpret this resolution as a mandate to do any particular thing or to bind this Government in any manner, that person will be departing from the spirit and the letter of the resolution.

I think this debate has made it so plain that there is no possibility of misunderstanding that there is no grant of power to the Executive; we have the direct word of the author of the resolution for that in his remarks today. There is no direction to enter into any alliance. There is no implied authorization to set up any world W. P. A.

It also should be emphasized as a matter of record that there is no commitment, direct or implied, on the part of any Member of the House that because of his vote in support of this resolution he will vote for or support any plan or proposal brought back to the Congress for ratification or approval. Each and every one of us is left entirely free to follow his own judgment and the dictates of his own conscience, if and when he is called upon in the future to pass on the merits or advisability of any tentative agreement entered in or any arrangement made by representatives of the United States with representatives of other nations.

To sum up, most of our people strongly favor some intelligent and energetic effort to establish and maintain a fair, just, and enduring peace. A majority here apparently feel that this resolution

is a reflection of that sentiment and a step in the desired direction. Some have apprehended that it might be interpreted as a blank check to the Executive in making peace. That fear has been dissipated by the assurances that now are a matter of official record. Others have thought that perhaps by voting for the resolution they would be committing themselves to support any kind of peace terms agreed upon at the international council table or any kind of system proposed to be set up to maintain peace. We likewise are definitely assured that such is not the case; that we will retain complete freedom of action on any proposals later submitted.

In the light of those facts and assurances and because this expression on the part of the Congress would be encouraging to the other United Nations and helpful in promoting unity among those seeking a lasting peace, I believe this resolution should be passed.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, some time ago before the Fulbright resolution was presented to the House I sent out a questionnaire to several thousand people in my district in order to ascertain their views on various important and pressing public questions. One of the questions which I asked read as follows:

Do you favor participating with other nations in some sort of international organization which would be effective in preventing aggression and for the maintenance of peace after this war has been won?

It was interesting to me to observe that more people answered that question than any other question on my questionnaire, which included 33 questions, and it was even more interesting to observe that of those who did answer it 93 percent said "Yes." In so doing it will be evident that, though neither they nor I was conscious of it at the time, they were in effect giving approval to the Fulbright resolution.

I have wondered why so overwhelming a majority expressed themselves as they did. And I think it was basically because the ordinary people of the world pay such a terrific price whenever a war takes place. Americans will do that. They can do it and they will do it through patriotic motives and love of country alone, if necessary. But it helps a great deal if people can see a hope ahead and if they can feel that their sacrifice is not only for the defense of their Nation's life but also a means of building positive gains for their children in the future.

As I conceive it, the most important single job this Congress has to do is the prevention of future wars. I cannot see that the bringing of this resolution into the House of Representatives is a matter of no significance, as some people have said. If I am correct, and I believe I am, this will be the first time that the House of Representatives has made a pronouncement of this character on the foreign policy of our country. In my opinion, it is altogether fitting and proper that we should do so. Nor can I see how

it can possibly be interpreted as some have attempted to interpret it as a surrender of any of the prerogatives or rights of the Congress. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is an assertion by this House that we recognize that we, too, have a share of the responsibility for preventing future wars and for guiding our country's action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we assume, and I think we must, that our paramount and primary duty is to keep faith with the men who are winning this war by helping to build a peace that will prevent a similar world tragedy every 25 or 30 years then we may ask, How can that be done? Well, I confess to being one of those people who hoped most earnestly before Pearl Harbor or at least up until a few months before Pearl Harbor that by means of staying in our own corner of the world we might avoid involvement in war. But we have to learn from experience. The isolationist method of attempting to keep America out of war has been proven to be inadequate in this small world, and we do live in a small world. If the experience of the past 30 years proves anything I believe it proves that.

The second possibility is the bringing about of some kind of an alliance between our country and maybe Great Britain or some other single nation and thus assembling and keeping assembled a military force so overwhelming as to be able to maintain peace. The danger in such a course, to say nothing of its overwhelming expense, is certainly very obvious. Inevitably it would lead to growing resentment in the rest of the world and to the formation of counter-alliances in the old balance of power fashion. Peace has never been maintained for long that way.

The only other alternative that exists is the alternative offered by the general policy contained in the Fulbright resolution—the policy of substituting for continual conflict an international order based on equity and on law. For this reason I believe it is our duty to pass this resolution.

It alone will of course not assure peace. Indeed before we can expect any organization for the preservation of peace to have any hope of success we must root out and deal with the basic causes of war, the sources of conflict. But that too can be done.

I know there will be some who will say it cannot be done. They will contend that there have always been wars and always will be. I simply do not believe they can be right. For this war is proving that a continuance of this sort of destruction will mean the utter destruction of such progress as man has made in thousands of years. Win it we must, whatever the cost. But having won it, it must stay won not for our own sakes alone but for the sake of all mankind. And who is to say that all the history of the upward climb of man along a path stony, steep, and difficult, a climb on which he has been led by the

unseen hand of a providence that aided mankind well—who is to say the end of that long path is a precipice over which we are foreordained to plunge ourselves. No. To believe that is to deny the whole purpose of human life. God has made possible a better fate for us if we but have vision to see.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. We are at war. The all important thing for us to do is to win that war. Our sons are giving their lives and limbs on foreign battlefields. This is no time for creating disunity not only of the American people but of our allies.

I also agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] that this resolution is either a blank check that will come home to plague us or it is a fraud and deception. I feel that it is both a blank check and political camouflage. It can serve no useful purpose. No one now knows what the terms of peace will be or what the "adequate power" mentioned in the resolution is to be used for.

We went into this war to protect the smaller nations against aggressor nations. Now suppose that at the end of this war that some nation should insist upon taking over these smaller nations. Is this "adequate power" to be used to keep these smaller nations under subjugation? These are problems that we can only decide after the war is won and the peace terms known.

I, too, have mingled with the people during the so-called recess. I have spoken to large crowds in several States. I have been on the trains most of the time. I have stood in trains crowded with soldiers without a seat. I know that the American people and the men in service are sick and tired of having Congress hand out blank checks for financial or political purposes to the "give-me Jimmies" of the world. These servicemen are more concerned with what is going to be done for them when they return than they are with policing the world after they have won this war.

It is so easy to deceive ourselves by wishful thinking. We all want permanent peace, but, unfortunately, mere words will not bring about that result. As I listened yesterday to the appeals of some of my colleagues I wondered whether they were placing the welfare of their Nation above their own political welfare. I do not believe that any Member of this House is foolish enough to believe that the passing of this resolution will bring about permanent peace.

Throughout the ages there has been, and will be, a desire for permanent peace. Yet the institution of war is as old as man. It had its inception when Cain arose and slew his brother Abel. The world has been cursed with it ever since. It is the hope of all that war may be ultimately abolished, but to jump from the frying pan into the fire is no solution. That will not bring about permanent peace but may bring about permanent friction and war.

There were many "one worlders" before. The idea of bringing about permanent peace by force was tried by Augustus Caesar, Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, Napoleon, and now by Hitler and lesser satellites but it always failed. The very idea of force means war. The very idea of adequate power means war. If this power had been adequate in the days of the former "one worlders" then the world perhaps would not be worth living in. It would have been subjugation and slavery by force.

The insinuation that if we had joined the League of Nations that then there would not have been another war is again the child of wishful thinking. Great Britain, China, Russia, Italy, Japan, Germany, and Austria were all members of the League of Nations. Why did they not bring about permanent peace? That was the object of the League.

When Japan wanted to grab a part of China, she resigned from the League. China's entering the League did not assure her peace or justice. The United States offered to back the League. So did Great Britain, but then shied away. Would it be too much to say that there was a falling out among the aggressors as far as the League was concerned? May we not say that history may repeat itself? Let us have the courage to act wisely and become fully informed before we blindly commit our Nation to a blind rendezvous.

A few years ago I heard a former president of the League of Nations complain about the Big Three. He told us that the Big Three were not interested in the welfare of the smaller nations, that they were selfish and grasping. He named the Big Three at that time as being composed of Great Britain, France, and Italy. He assumed that if the United States had also come into the League that then the smaller nations would have been safe. Of course, he did not know that if we had joined the League it would have been the Big Four in place of the Big Three.

I recently saw a cartoon where Uncle Sam was reading the Declaration of Independence. Miss Columbia, all dressed up and bedecked with the Stars and Stripes, was admiring her Uncle. There was a fence and a vacant lot. The vacant lot was designated "European intrigue." A little further down was "lover's lane." At the end of "lover's lane" was "super government." In the vacant lot, leaning on the fence, was an individual. He was whispering to Miss Columbia, "Are you looking for a blind date?" Is this resolution the blind date? Miss Columbia gave the cold shoulder to that individual. The American people will also give the cold shoulder to the "one worlders." They will not surrender their sovereignty. They will not sell out the future of this Nation to the "one worlders."

There is only one solution for the smaller nations of Europe—if there are any left when the peace treaty is finally signed—and that is for them to form the United States of Europe. They must abandon their religious and racial ha-

treds. We are all for helping them. We are all for cooperation and collaboration after the war ends, but let us win the victory first.

The other day the President gave us a picture of the war progress. We have reason to be proud of that record. It is we—the people—in action. It appears that America is doing more than her share of furnishing the manpower and material to win this war. We are glad to do this, but we are not going to accept the blind date. We are not going to surrender our sovereignty. We are not going to continue to finance the world. We are not going to continue to police it. We are all for cooperation and collaboration, but other nations must do their share. Uncle Sam is not going to be a perpetual Santa Claus.

There never was a time that the United States did not cooperate and collaborate with any nation that wanted permanent peace. We are all for peace. We hope that when this war is ended there will be a sufficient cooling off period given before the final peace and the machinery for permanent peace is established.

Let me also assure you that when the boys come back from the battle fronts they are going to have something to say about the future of this Nation and its relation with other nations. I am confident they will be favorable to cooperation and collaboration and friendship among the United Nations. They will, however, never substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes. You can stake your life on that.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Fulbright resolution. While it does not undertake to offer a blueprint for the future nor could it hope to do so, it is in an important sense a guidepost to the intentions of the American people and of their representatives.

I think that it is extremely important that this Nation's foreign policy shall not descend by edict from above but shall rise from the people. No foreign policy has any chance of enduring unless it shall represent the considered opinion of the very great majority of American citizens and such opinion cannot be a considered opinion unless it has been fully debated and discussed throughout the Nation.

I am glad this resolution has been presented to us. I hope that in the future our Government will be more candid in giving us sufficient information as to its intentions toward the rest of the world. A lasting American foreign policy can only be based upon informed discussion, and informed discussion can only take place if the information is supplied. The information, in turn, can only come from the Government. Therefore, unless the Government informs the people it cannot complain if, having kept the facts secret too long, the public and its representatives balk at adopting such foreign policies as the administration may seek to force through the legislature.

The people of America are reasonable people. They will do the right thing and they can be trusted. They would like their Government to be reasonable too. They would like to trust their Government. It would be a lot easier for them to trust their Government if they felt their Government trusted them.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I listened to the debate, supposedly on the Fulbright resolution, which is the only business before the House and I regret to say that most of the speeches dealt with many other things than the Fulbright resolution and much effort was exerted to play upon the emotions of the Members. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to save as much time as possible by confining my remarks to the resolution under consideration.

A great deal has been said regarding the interpretation that might be put upon the three words in the resolution, "appropriate international machinery." Inasmuch as different Members interpreted these words differently, I sought Webster's New International Dictionary for their definition, and this is what I find: "appropriate" means to set apart for a particular use; "international" means a person—in this case nation—having relations or obligations to two nations; "machinery" is defined as the assemblage of contrivances. For fear there might be a multitude of interpretations put upon the word "contrivances," I find the same dictionary defines this word as "a scheme." Therefore when one inserts the definitions for the three words "appropriate international machinery" into the Fulbright resolution, it would make it read as follows:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a scheme obligating the Congress to other nations with funds and men adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

It is obvious the phrase "among the nations of the world" is not necessary and does not add anything to the resolution, because the definition of the word international means relations with, or obligations to, other nations. Likewise the phrase "and as favoring participation by the United States." It has already been set forth in the resolution that you favor obligating the Congress to other nations in much stronger language than just favoring participation by the United States. Therefore we are able to omit that phrase.

Then as a clever idea, hoping to catch enough Members who have not made up their minds, the original resolution was amended by adding "through its constitutional processes." Every Member of this House knows that before he can become a Member of this body he had to take the following oath:

I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true

faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Mr. Speaker, surely every Member of the House of Representatives took that oath in good faith, and that being true, and I hope it is, you will not want to do anything that is not through constitutional processes. Granting that is true, it should not be necessary to reaffirm to the world we mean to keep our oath of office. Therefore, the amendment to the original resolution can be omitted as not adding anything of value that is not already provided for.

Therefore, when you have omitted the surplusage of words and phrases to the Fulbright resolution, it is boiled down to the following: "That Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a scheme obligating the Congress to other nations with funds and men adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace."

Now, who in the name of Jehovah is willing to stand up now and prove he can guarantee to maintain a just and lasting peace?

I yield to no man in my sincere desire to contribute my share in every possible way toward bringing about a more harmonious relationship between the nations of the earth and working toward a lasting peace. But before I can conscientiously vote for this particular resolution in its present form, and considering the circumstances under which it is brought before Congress, the following questions will have to be answered satisfactorily:

First. Why should any resolution be brought before Congress under the gag rule which prohibits Members of Congress representing more than 400 congressional districts in the United States from expressing their views by offering amendments?

Second. Does not the Fulbright resolution commit the United States to action agreed upon by a majority of other nations?

Third. Would it not be a good idea to first maintain a just and lasting peace within the borders of the United States and its territories by eliminating lynching and race riots as an example of our ability to maintain peace at home before we assume the responsibility of maintaining peace throughout the world?

Fourth. Is the author of this resolution in a position to guarantee to the Congress, if this resolution is passed, there are no secret agreements between any of the nations of the world that would not lead us to another war if we started to invoke the adequate power of the appropriate international machinery?

Fifth. I have heard a great deal said during debates against dictators and admonishing us to follow democratic processes. Is there a single Member of this Congress who is willing to stand up now before the House and say that bringing the Fulbright resolution before

the House of Representatives under a gag rule which prohibits over 400 representatives of the people from expressing their views by offering amendments, is not exactly the kind of procedure practiced by dictators?

Sixth. The author of this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], admitted yesterday he discussed the resolution with the President. In view of that statement, are we still supposed to be so gullible as to believe this resolution is the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee and that committee alone?

I would like to have someone attempt to convince me that this is not another scheme, like a lot of propaganda put out by the Office of War Information, to help lay the foundation to make the President of the United States the first International President of the World. Last May the President of the United States was responsible for bringing together the representatives of 38 nations, including the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, at Hot Springs, Va., to what was known as the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

Why is it not just as important to bring together representatives of the United Nations at this time to consider the peace aims of all these countries? Certainly all these nations are considering and making post-war plans. Therefore, would it not be fitting and proper to bring them together and have their plans expressed in the open? For all anyone knows, there may have been some discussions at Hot Springs regarding the peace aims of various countries, but inasmuch as it was a secret conference we have no way of knowing what took place there.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, offered the following resolution yesterday morning at a meeting of that committee:

Be it further resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a Post-War Planning Commission, comprised equally of Democrats and Republicans, for the purpose of analyzing various forms of appropriate international machinery for the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and for making recommendations to the President and the Congress as to the position which the United States should occupy in the post-war world in the light of what is considered to be intelligent and effective foreign and domestic policy.

In view of the fact it seems to be the desire of the present administration to establish various boards and commissions on post-war planning, including the cradle-to-the-grave commission, why would it not be far better to have adopted Mr. MUNDT's resolution and had something definite brought before Congress for consideration and action rather than a vague, weak, and meaningless resolution open to any interpretation anyone cares to put on it.

Hanging on the wall of the home of George Washington at Mount Vernon is a plate which was presented to him through Congress, a plate designed by

Dr. Charles Buxton and made and presented by the publisher, Charles Smith, in 1798. The title of this plate is "The Bowling Green Washington." There are two shafts on each side of the plate similar in design to the Washington Monument. On the base of one shaft is inscribed the word "Liberty," on the other "Independence." George Washington is standing on the base of a pedestal on which are inscribed these words: "Sacred to patriotism." At the bottom of the plate one reads the following: "This plate is with our respect inscribed to the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, need I say more than to remind the membership of this House to be ever faithful to their oath of office and to be ready at all times to fight for those gallant principles which we all admire in George Washington?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

OUR JOB IS TO WIN THE WAR AS QUICKLY
AS POSSIBLE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, our job is to win the war as quickly as possible. And when it comes to the peace, it is our sworn duty to protect the interests of the United States and its citizens. Too much visionary speculation at the present time for bringing the "four freedoms" to the rest of the world may cause disunity amongst the United Nations, and certainly, after the peace is written, our country will be the most hated Nation in the world because of our inability to give the promised Utopia to the suffering peoples of the globe.

To be sure, everyone wants a permanent peace, when victory is won, and we should do our part to achieve this object with other free nations of the world. It is much too early to make definite plans for the post-war era. Time and events will be the controlling factors to determine our course in this respect. Above all, our enemies must be defeated, and then we can take our part at the peace table to make solemn commitments without destroying our national sovereignty or jeopardizing the future welfare of the American people.

Under the Constitution, it is not within the provinces of the House of Representatives to pass upon treaties or international agreements. This authority is vested in the Senate. In view of this fact, it is rather difficult for me to understand why the leadership of the House has now brought the Fulbright resolution before us for consideration. The leaders, on both sides of the aisle, do not expect the Senate to approve the resolution. One reason given for considering the resolution is that the Representatives, who are close to the people, should express the views of American citizens for an arrangement which will guarantee permanent peace for the world. If such be the case why is it that the Democratic leadership ventures to consider the resolution under a gag rule which prohibits the consideration of amendments? Can it be that they do not trust the representatives of the people? If that be true, we

must assume that the Democratic leaders do not trust the rank and file of the American people. If this is to be a people's peace, then the people should have something to say about it through their chosen representatives, and the resolution should be considered under the general rules of the House with an opportunity to consider amendments.

To make certain that the Fulbright resolution could not be construed as giving the President authority to bypass Congress in its constitutional right to consider treaties and international agreements, I presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House the following amendment to the resolution:

Provided, however, The approval of this resolution shall not be construed as legislative consent to any international agreement or treaty contrary to the method for such approval provided therefor by the Constitution of the United States.

Under the gag rule, I am not permitted to offer this amendment in the House. The purpose of my amendment was to guarantee to the American people that the Constitution of the United States would be strictly followed when the time came for considering specific proposals for international cooperation to assure permanent peace, and in such manner the people would speak through their chosen Representatives in Congress on the merits of such treaties and international agreements. While the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not adopt my amendment in its entirety, I am nevertheless pleased that they have agreed to the idea that constitutional procedure must be followed in the consideration of proposals to carry out the general objectives of the Fulbright resolution.

The action of the Foreign Affairs Committee in offering the constitutional procedure amendment as a part of the motion to suspend the rules, coupled with the statement of the chairman and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the effect that the Constitution of the United States will be followed in the consideration of specific treaties to carry out the objectives sought by the Fulbright resolution, is an assurance of definite legislative intent, which must not be bypassed by the Executive or his State Department. As one Representative in this House, I want the constitutional body in Congress to pass upon the merits of every proposal which is to bind our country in its relations with the nations of the world. If it were not for this safeguard, I would not vote for the Fulbright resolution.

Furthermore, I want to make it clear, that when specific proposals are made for international participation on the part of the United States to set up machinery to maintain world peace, I will insist:

First. That all such treaties and international agreements be openly made and passed on by the Congress in the manner provided by the Constitution of the United States.

Second. That the security and welfare of American people shall always be given first consideration.

Third. That no foreign alliance be entered into which will jeopardize the sovereignty of the United States or dissipate our resources. I shall vigorously oppose any scheme which contemplates that the United States shall play the role of Santa Claus for the rest of the world.

Fourth. That in our effort to secure a lasting peace, our enemies shall be disarmed, their armament works and war machinery shall be kept permanently destroyed, and all individuals, companies, corporations, or governments, within the United Nations or elsewhere, engaged in the manufacture of war materials or things that can be used for war purposes, shall forever be prohibited under heavy penalty from providing any potential enemy with such war supplies and materials.

I have tried to make my position clear as I do not want any misunderstanding of my views of the part our country is to take in the post-war collaboration to maintain a lasting peace. My first duty is to my country and the American people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the pending resolution.

The hope of the American people for a war-free world represents the real essence of this measure. In understandable, honest terms it seeks to translate our feelings and our thoughts as to the approach we should make as a great nation in establishing and maintaining a just peace.

The resolution is a simple expression of a basic principle. Is there anyone who does not favor the creation of appropriate international machinery with power to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace? And is it not necessary that the United States participate therein? Surely wise self-interest urges the adoption of this declaration of policy at this time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, last June I was permitted to speak briefly in favor of this resolution. The reasons for its adoption which seemed to me compelling at that time are more cogent and compelling now.

We have already procured the unconditional surrender of Italy, and various other nations will detach themselves from the Axis when and if they think it to their advantage so to do. I do not doubt that a prime consideration with these nations is the desire to be with the winner. But all of these smaller countries of Europe would like to know whether this country is going to go the way it went in 1919 or to choose another course. I do not care whether you say that this country ran out on its responsibilities in 1919 or walked out or what other metaphor you employ. The fact is that we were so afraid of being entangled by the alliance which had enabled us to win the war that we dropped out of it, and in 1941 we found ourselves entan-

gled not in an alliance but in a war which a sufficiently firm alliance preserved since 1918 could and would have prevented.

I believe that if the smaller nations of Europe can be made to realize today that this country wants appropriate international machinery to establish and maintain peace they will join us as quick as they can. These small countries lack every capacity to make war. They have no chance of survival save through some system of collective security. Convince them that they will have such a system and they will aid you in the prosecution of this war and feel certain that they can give aid. The people of Hungary and Bulgaria and Rumania have not fought for Hitler because they loved him so much but because they had no means of resisting his aggressions.

Next month we are to confer in Moscow with representatives of Russia and Britain, and possibly other powers. Will these representatives not be assisted by knowing that we are interested in "appropriate international machinery to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace"? As to what machinery would be just, there is all the room in the world for honest difference of opinion and free discussion. But if we are not in favor of any international machinery, then why pay the expenses of Mr. Hull or any other American representative on the long trip to Moscow. Surely you cannot expect other nations to make or even to consider any commitments to us unless we are willing to contemplate commitments to them.

The opposition to this resolution is largely fanciful, based on unfounded fears of something ulterior which might happen when some particular piece of international machinery has been fabricated. But there will be plenty of time to scrutinize and consider the wheels and the spindles. How could this Congress by the passage of this resolution repeal a single syllable of our Constitution or a single statute of the United States? What is there here which would modify our policy of immigration, change a tariff, sacrifice our right to our aerial commerce, or lend ourselves to any of the horrors that have been conjured up?

As the gentleman from Arkansas observed, this resolution gives no grant of power to the Executive. It is not a blank check. It is not a check at all. It is a notice to the world that we want a bank of good will established, and that we want some recognizable and enforceable negotiable instrument law, and not a lot of people skulking in corners with guns in their hands and masks over their faces.

I do not consider that any of us has a mandate to liquidate the affairs or property of this Republic any more than Mr. Churchill has a mandate to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. But let us recognize the plain fact that Mr. Hitler was out to liquidate—took the mandate of his people to liquidate both the British Empire and the American Republic as thoroughly as he liquidated the French Republic and the Kingdoms of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and Greece,

and so on down the line. It is the prevention of that kind of liquidation that interests me, and in declaring against this kind of liquidation I think first, last, and all the time of the United States, which with all its might and power is outnumbered more than 10 to 1 by the other peoples of the earth.

Let us not be so vain as to imagine that our great power is omnipotent. Let us not lose in sloth or arrogance, as we did before, the victory which had cost us so dear.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the resolution offered by the able and distinguished member from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and denominated House Concurrent Resolution 25. I think it is altogether fitting that such a resolution should originate in this House of the Congress and, furthermore, that now is the acceptable time to go on record as to the subject matter.

Treating these points in their inverse order, I feel, first, that the longer the legislative branch of our Government equivocates by taking refuge in silence or in meaningless generalities on the subject of post-war peace, the longer will be the postponement of that unity of effort among the allied and embattled nations productive of a speedy termination of the war. We know that the legislative branch of the Government scrapped the plan for peace tardily enunciated in the closing days of the last World War. We know that effort was not only abortive but late. The allied nations committed with us to the war on aggressions have not forgotten that failure and it is now imperative for us to take timely steps giving assurance that such a failure will not occur again. A frank, clear, and authoritative declaration at this time will do measureless good, whereas its absence will work irreparable harm.

The origination of this resolution in this House is well advised. The House of Representatives is the popular chamber of the Congress, being proportioned to population, of recent and short tenure of office, and thus closest and most responsive to the popular will. True it does not hold the veto over treaties, as does the Senate, and, true, it does not conduct negotiations with foreign powers, as does the Executive, but this House does hear and express the voice and desire of the people and this resolution has no other function than to declare its understanding of and its intention to carry out that voice and will. I feel, therefore, that we should not decline to speak out at this time merely for reasons of deference to any other agency of Government. We must look to our duty and do it as we see it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is singularly and admirably free from complexity. We do not pretend to outline the terms of any treaty of peace. We do not pretend to "ride the lightning or direct the storm" of any military engagement. We concern ourselves with expressing our own concept of the sense of the people

to effect that henceforth it will be our duty to currently set up and maintain, by an adequate share of contribution and sanction, international machinery to preserve the peace of the world. That is what we refused to do after the last war.

I do not conceive, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution will embarrass the military arm in restoring and maintaining order immediately after the belligerent enemy forces are brought to their knees. Nor are we concluded thereby in the matter of alleviating that scourge of starvation and depletion that will be most acute when the cannons are silenced. We do, it is true, commit ourselves, by the import of this resolution, to such a surrender of our freedom of action, or rather our past repudiation of the duty to act, that some people call an attribute of sovereignty. But I would remark that in civil municipal law we are accustomed to surrender a part of our freedom in order to secure and make safe the whole thereof, and if we are to learn by experience we must conclude that henceforth in the world we must, in the language of Franklin, "hang together or we will hang separately."

I feel, too, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution will be very advantageous of crystallizing public sentiment in this country. The desire for peace among our people in the past has been so strong that we have been living like an ostrich with its head in the sand, or flapping along like a scarecrow in a cornfield. We have always waited for the first blow and now we realize that some day the first blow will be the last. We must be militant from now on and it is better to be militant for peace than for war.

In the absence of participation in any league to enforce peace in the past we have perforce contented ourselves by addressing homilies to offending nations and prayerful encouragements to the better-disposed countries in an endeavor to preserve the status quo. The result has been destructive alike to our prestige and our pride that stood at a high-level mark immediately after the last war. It is true that with practically identical ideas of right and wrong we might for a time by parallel action and pronouncement restrain evil-doers, but until we are committed to action and not talk, and action to the uttermost, we shall never improve the good-neighborhood of the world. Walter Lippmann has charged that we have never had a foreign policy. That in a measure is true. Our historic policy has not been policy at all except a policy of action which has been as old as Patrick Henry's day when he said: "We must fight; I repeat it, sir, we must fight." We always have fought when we had no alternative, when in the language quoted by Woodrow Wilson: "God helping us, we can do no other."

The American people and the world must face this fact and the sooner the better: We must raise a standard to which the wise and the just can repair. The event is in the hands of God.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution as amended. It embodies my settled convictions on the proposition and is expressive of the will of the people I represent in this body.

The resolution simply expresses the feelings of the Members of the House of Representatives that we favor "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States through its constitutional processes." This is a joint resolution. If it is adopted by the Senate, then it is an expression by the Congress in favor of the objectives stated in the resolution. It does not have the force of law.

I favor such a treaty between this Nation and the nations with whom we are now allied in the war to defeat Germany and Japan and their satellite allies to create appropriate machinery to establish peace upon a just basis. We are justified in believing that such a peace would be lasting. And when such a peace is agreed upon, it must be enforced with power. And, of course, if we become a party to such a treaty, we must participate in its enforcement to make it effective.

Our armed forces are fighting alongside of the British, the Russians, the Chinese, the French, and other peoples who are allied with us. With them we will win the war. With them we must and can win the peace. The great majority of the American people are determined that the fruits of victory shall not turn to ashes upon their lips. They are of one mind that the spending of our treasure and the shedding of the blood of our strongest, bravest, and best shall not be in vain.

The resolution provides that whatever we do shall be done through the means provided by the Constitution. This expression limits the approval to any plan for the establishment, maintenance, and enforcement of world peace to the treaty making power of the President, which can only be exercised "by and with the consent of the Senate." And this consent of the Senate to make a treaty effective must be by a vote of two-thirds of the membership present.

The Constitution further provides:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

So it is seen that the adoption of this resolution, of necessity, leaves to the President, the Senate, and the whole Congress, when victory shall have been won, the making of the necessary treaty or treaties, and the enacting of legislation to preserve the peace of the world. Such treaties, and such laws, will require machinery to carry them into effect.

The good faith, the unity, that now exists between our country and our allies,

we may well assume, will continue when Germany and Japan are defeated. To say that the United Nations cannot work together in peace as they are now cooperating in war is to confess that civilization is a failure. And this we are not prepared to admit. The adoption of this resolution will help to win the war; it will strengthen the morale of all the allied peoples. It may well be the first step on our part to a "peace on earth, good will toward men" that for years to come will enable the decent peoples of the earth to enjoy ordered liberty under law, free from the fear of ever recurring wars.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from the resolution and the resolution adopted by the Mackinac Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have for some time given the deepest consideration of which I am capable to the questions raised by the Fulbright resolution before the House today. The resolution may be no more than a pious hope as expressed by some of the able and experienced Members of the House, and on the other hand, it may be fraught with perils for the future of our country as expressed by other Members equally as able and experienced. If this resolution is adopted by the Senate, and I do not believe it will be, the effect upon our country in the future will depend largely upon the thinking and attitude of mind of those in charge of our Government. I regret exceedingly that those in charge of the House insisted on bringing up this resolution under suspension of the rules of the House, thereby making it impossible to offer, have considered, or adopted, any amendment. We must vote for or against the resolution as is without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

The resolution is embraced in a single sentence containing only six lines. It declares:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

The resolution as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee of the House did not contain the words "through its constitutional processes." The Republican leader of the House [Mr. MARTIN] and the Republican steering committee of the House, of which I am a member, insisted that the Foreign Relations Committee reassemble and add the words "through its constitutional processes."

Of course, I strongly favored that amendment. No one could be more deeply interested than I am in establish-

ing and maintaining a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world. Our country is not seeking the territory of any other nation or the right to exercise autocratic powers over any other people or peoples. We are a peace- and liberty-loving people. We desire that justice shall prevail in all the dealings between the nations of the earth, and, of course, the American people greatly desire a just and lasting peace when this war ends. There is no doubt the people generally of the world are yearning for peace, and, excepting those who desire conquest and control of other peoples or minorities, entertain the fervent hope that there will be a just and lasting peace. To inquire if any loyal American citizen is in favor of a just and lasting peace would be about the same as I observed many times during my youth while attending rural church revivals, when the minister would put the question to those present, "All who are in favor of going to heaven stand up." Of course, such proposal received unanimous response from the sinners as well as the saints in the congregation. What person in the congregation did not hope some day he would live in the holy city of the New Jerusalem, walk its golden streets, sit under the tree of life on the banks of the river of life with a golden harp in his hand? But I found that there was much difference of opinion as to the course each individual person should follow to attain that desired end.

Let us bear in mind that this resolution has nothing to do with bringing about peace. We are still at war with Germany, Japan, and some of their lesser satellites. President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and representatives of other Allied Nations have declared time and again that they will not consider anything short of unconditional surrender of our enemies. We are therefore committed to the policy of terminating the war by force—military might. If this resolution means anything, it means that after we have won an unconditional surrender by force, that we participate in the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world. It offers no hint or suggestion as to how that is to be accomplished. It lays down no formula to be followed by our country or any other country. It does not explain what is meant by "appropriate international machinery" or what power is to be used to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. There have been many world changes in the last few months, and there will be many more before we have brought about the unconditional surrender of our enemies. No one has the power to lift the veil that hides the future from us and say with any degree of certainty what conditions will confront our country and the world when the war is over. Does this international machinery and power contemplate that our Army and Navy and the armies and navies of other countries will constitute the means by which we will establish and maintain peace? Does it mean that we shall participate in the policing of the world by keeping millions of our

young men 2, 3, or 5 years or longer after the war on the five continents, the seven seas, and the thousands of islands of the world? Could lasting peace be established and maintained by force? Are we to use this force against all those nations that refuse to join in with the program of ourselves and one or two other nations? Are we to bear an unjust proportion of this heavy burden, or, as some people have suggested, will we set up a world-wide W. P. A. requiring that the American taxpayers feed, clothe, and otherwise provide over a period of many years for tens and tens of millions of people of other countries in order to keep them satisfied and peaceful? Or will we be called upon to join a supergovernment made up of ourselves, the British Empire, Russia, China, and some other nations and include conquered Germany, Italy, and Japan?

There is a considerable organization in this country now with some outstanding men and women at the head of it, supplied with plenty of money, who insist on setting up that kind of superworld government, with a constitution of its own to displace the Constitution of the United States, and a world nation's flag to supplant the Stars and Stripes. This supernational to elect a president, vice president, members of the legislative body, according to the population of the various member countries as we now do in the United States, or will it be some other kind of federation of nations advocated by others, or will the price required of us be that we repeal our immigration laws and take away the protection that the American farmers, American industry, and the American workers now have under our protective laws, so that the peoples of the various countries may move freely from one part of this world nation to the other, and that their products may move freely in competition with the American farmers, American industry, and American workers; and if there should be such a superworld government of this supernational, would the majority elect an Englishman, Russian, Chinaman, Italian, or citizen of some other one of the member nations as the head of this supergovernment, or would many other nations elect a congress in which the people of the United States would have little to say? We already have announcements that the reciprocal trade agreements would be used freely to induce other countries to go into this supergovernment or some allied cooperative government, federation, or world arrangement. Or would the fact that we have more wealth per capita than other countries require the people of the United States to contribute the lion's share toward the maintenance of such supergovernment or any allied cooperative federation, or the maintenance of this international machinery? This resolution is silent on all of these matters.

Thirty-three nations have signed up as members of the Allied governments cooperating with us actively or passively in the present war. Many of them are receiving great sums of money, credits, and munitions of war through the Lend-Lease, but are merely sitting in the cheering section and have furnished no

men or ships to fight the common enemy. How is the course that we should pursue to be determined? Will these 33 nations have an equal voice in determining that course, or will the nation's voice be determined by its population? We know that those in charge of the present administration in Washington are strongly inclined toward internationalism. Instead of placing the welfare of our own country first, many other countries are first in their thinking. We admire Prime Minister Churchill for his ability, and because he never fails to speak up for the British Empire. He and the British people place their country's welfare first. Mr. Churchill announced to the world that as the Head Minister of the British Empire that he was not placed in that position to preside over the liquidation of the Empire. This unswerving zeal has characterized the attitude of Premier Stalin and the Russian people. They have placed Russia and the interests of the Russian people first. As the present war progresses and the post-war situation unfolds, we shall see more and more clearly that Mr. Stalin and the Russian people never lose sight of the best interests of their own country.

In order that my motives may not be misunderstood, I shall vote for this resolution. We are in the war. No stone should be left unturned to win it at the earliest moment possible so that your sons, my son, and the sons of millions of other fathers and mothers may return to their homes and loved ones, and our country be restored once more to normal living. The President and some of the other outstanding leaders in the Army and Navy have expressed the belief that this war may not be over before 1949. I do not think that that opinion is justified. It may not be over before 1945, and I firmly believe that the American people will not place Mr. Roosevelt and the present administration in power for another 4 years. They will select some able man who will prosecute the war with more vigor than it is at present being prosecuted, and that man and a Republican House, and perhaps a Republican Senate will not abuse any latent power that there may be under this resolution, but will look first to the welfare of our own country and the American people. After this great carnage, loss of lives, and the sacrifice of the American people, we all desire to see a just and lasting peace. It is generally admitted here that the resolution that we shall likely pass today will go to the Senate and end there. I am sure that the Senate will give this important subject more consideration and a wider inquiry and discussion, with plenty of opportunities to propose amendments, than we had under the gag rule here in the House. When this matter comes back to the House in a conference report of the House and Senate, we will have an opportunity to vote for something that cannot be designated as a futile gesture or that will imperil the rights of the people of our own country.

THE MACKINAC FOREIGN POLICY COMMITTEE

There was brought together at Mackinac, Mich., early in September 1943, 12

Republican Members of the House, a number of Republican Members of the Senate, the Governors of 24 States, and many other outstanding Republican leaders of the Nation. They formed what is known as the Committee on Foreign Policy and International Relations. Every shade of thought on the important question of our foreign policy and international relations after the war was represented. After days of thorough study and discussion this great committee on September 7, 1943, issued a report in which, among other things, they used this language:

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression, and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for (1) its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation; (2) its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

You will observe that the committee of Republican leaders in Mackinac set forth first: "We must preserve and protect all of our national interests." This is the identical policy that has been and is being followed by Great Britain, Russia, and China, our active allies, in this great war, and they stated, "we must do our full share in the program for permanent peace among nations," and furthermore, they stated, "prosecution of the war by a united nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including disarmament of the Axis Powers, 'disqualify the Axis Powers to construct facilities for the manufacture of implements of war.'" They say that the foreign policy and domestic policy of our country and every other country are allied to each other, and in considering our foreign policy we must not lose sight of our domestic policy in the war—its effect upon the vital interest of the Nation—our Nation—its bearing upon the foreseeable

international developments, and then they make this significant statement, if there should be conflict between the vital interests of our own Nation and international matters, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government, and they also declared, in all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

In this way we bring into the picture for consultation and aid the experience of the heroic men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country and who too would be vitally interested in preserving a just and lasting peace and preserving and protecting our own national interests, our Constitution, and our form of government. We must be cooperative with other peoples of the world, but this does not mean that we should neglect the interest of the American people or weaken or destroy our own form of government and our own great country. We want to do justice. We want to help preserve the peace of the world, but we should place the welfare of our own country and our own people first.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, to win the war is not enough. We need not go far back in memory to recall another time when we fought and won a war against aggressor nations, a war to make the world safe for democracy. We thought we gave democracy to the world. Then we turned our backs, and in nation after nation freedom exploded into anarchy, dictators reaped the benefit of America's good intentions. We must think ahead, for we cannot endure the horror and cost of war every 25 years. Human lives are too precious to be sacrificed in vain. This time we must also win the peace.

If we are to win the peace, it is not a day too soon to start laying the groundwork for a peace that is lasting and just. Today as never before the world looks to this Nation for leadership. If we again refuse to accept the mantle of world leadership, it must fall to other shoulders, and world policies will again be shaped by other hands. God forbid that they be the hands of another Hitler, but wishful thinking will not make them friendly hands or kind hands.

I know something of the evils of foreign entanglements, but likewise I know that America cannot build around itself a wall and exist in a world of its own. Neither policy will insure peace, and either of them can involve us in war. America has become of age. It is a great and powerful Nation, and the world has shrunk so that we cannot pretend to be unaffected by the things which concern our neighbors. Participation in world affairs is obviously unavoidable for this

Nation. Hence a judicious participation by our people, and a wise application of democratic leadership, may steer all the world away from war.

We gain nothing by avoiding the issue. Surely American statesmanship is big enough to meet squarely and to forge from this issue a clear, forceful, and beneficial policy. The passage of the resolution before us will show that the Congress, speaking for the American people, has the courage to face facts.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the most comforting, the most sustaining thought of our people today is the hope, ah, the prayer, that out of the crucible in which the nations of the world are writhing today there may come such a realistic vision of the blessings of peace and the futility of war, that the hearts of the peoples of the earth may be quickened and touched in such a way that they will rise in their might and demand that the nations of the earth band together and set up international machinery that will establish and maintain a just and lasting peace.

All the resolution before us today does is to boldly, publicly express to the world this American hope, this American prayer.

As a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he," and so will he act. The same is true of democratic nations, because the national heart of such nations is but the composite of the hearts of its people. Yes, the uppermost thought in the hearts of our people today, my colleagues, is that out of the devastating conflict that is now raging may come a just and lasting peace. And, be not deceived, our people demand that we, their representatives, give voice to their thoughts; yea, that we do more, that we translate their thoughts into a reality.

Timid souls may draw back, they may give vent to misgivings and fears, they may obstruct, they may impede, but thank God in a democracy they cannot suppress the thoughts of the people, nor can they arrest action by their chosen representatives in translating those thoughts into a reality.

Do I hear the timid cry that the words in the resolution, "power adequate to maintain a just and lasting peace," calls for the use of force? I answer "Yes," that is right, and the resolution should make such a declaration. And I make the answer because, as a practical man, I know that under the present state of civilization force is the only thing the aggressor nations will respect. I know that international peace, if effective, will have to be policed in the same way county, city, State, and national peace is policed.

May I ask these timid souls if it is right and proper to use force, if the necessity arises, to maintain local, State, and national peace, why is it not right and proper to use force, if the necessity arises, to maintain international peace? Oh, I know their stock-in-trade answer about losing a part of our sovereignty—that we will lose complete and unlimited

control over our own affairs. I answer that peace and security and safety through the centuries have traveled a long way, through the family unit, the tribal unit, the city unit, the county unit, the State unit, the national unit, and that each step in the progressive effort to bring peace and security and safety to all the people demanded, if the necessity arose, not only the use of force, but the surrender or giving up of something on the part of the people. But I know that in return for the something given up in each instance the members of the family unit, the tribal unit, the city unit, the county unit, the State unit, the national unit, received in return something infinitely greater, namely, peace and security and safety. And I know that there is something radically wrong when sovereignty is exercised in such a way as to safeguard and protect the peace and security and safety of its citizens all the way up from the family unit to the national unit only to let them fall prey, as they have twice in the past 25 years, to mechanized scientific international slaughters. Such a concept of sovereignty completely overlooks one of the fundamental rights the citizen should enjoy from the sovereign; international peace and security and safety and protection against international slaughter. And this, my colleagues, can only be accomplished by taking the next logical step in making the protective unit international in scope.

And, further, to those who make the spurious argument that to take such a step our Government would, to that extent, be losing its sovereignty, let me remind them of the fact that in a democracy sovereignty resides in the people, and that that sovereignty can be granted or withheld as to them may seem best. If the people think their peace, safety, and security will be best promoted by delegating a part of their sovereignty to an international set-up to police the nations of the world and hold them in check, can it be said that they have lost their sovereignty? Rather, should it not be said that they have wisely delegated a part of their sovereignty to further protect their sovereign, God-given right to peace, safety, and security?

If the sovereign people find out—and they have found out—that the sovereign rights delegated to the central government "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and their posterity do not fully vouchsafe to them that peace and that security that is the God-given heritage of a free and liberty-loving people, why should not they make a further delegation to some international agency or association that can vouchsafe that peace, that safety, and that security? Prudence and common sense dictate that they should. And remember that we will not have to give up a single sovereign right that the other member nations will not have to give up.

To the question, How is this international machinery to be set up? I answer

frankly: I do not know any more than the delegates to our Constitutional Convention knew when they met in Philadelphia just how our Federal Government would be set up. I do know that by exchanging ideas, by compromise, by toleration, the delegates finally got together and drafted a great system of government. They succeeded in coming to an agreement because the necessity was upon them; their general welfare, their happiness, their peace, their safety and security demanded action. And I am persuaded that the future peace and security of the world today demands action, and that if the representatives of the nations meet in the same spirit that animated our forefathers, a plan for world peace can be worked out.

Necessity is the mother of government, and I have not lost faith in the genius of man, when the necessity is upon him, to continue to work out problems of government. The process at times may be slow; but when driven by necessity, the solution has always been found. The necessity is upon us; the solution must and will be found.

The challenge to this generation is the working out of a just and lasting peace. Let us act the part of men, God-fearing, peace-loving, courageous men; men who are not afraid to assume the responsibilities of their day, and accept the challenge.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if time permitted I would enjoy studying with you a little while why the framers of our Constitution lodged so largely, if not exclusively, the conduct of our foreign affairs in the President of the United States subject to ratification by the Senate, but time will not permit. It is the constitutional process of our great Republic. Therefore, I accept it as founded on good reason.

We cannot make any contracts or treaties or enter into any obligations with foreign countries save through the initiative of the President of the United States. This Congress cannot make such an agreement with any country. Such agreements as the President makes must be ratified at least by the Senate branch of the Congress. So we need not be afraid of our committing ourselves in a strict legal sense to any technical and exact terms. We are simply exercising the right that the free people of this country have exercised since its foundation to undertake by public expression of their views to enlighten the conscience of the President and the ratifying power of the Senate about the conduct of foreign affairs.

This resolution simply expresses our opinion as representatives of the people, and I for one give it my hearty support because I wish to see this world organized for peace and against war. It ought to have been so organized some decades ago. We are not going to get as much benefit, probably, from any arrangement made when this war is over as we would have gotten if we had entered into such an arrangement some years back, be-

cause it will be a long time before the free people of this country will ever agree again to trust entirely to paper protection of the liberties of this country.

The old League of Nations covenant had in it a disarmament provision. I supported it as a humble public man down in my State with all my might. But now I would not support such a provision. Why? I want all the protection we can get from paper agreements with the great countries of the world, but I do not want to trust to that alone. I want to see our country adopt instead a wise policy of military training and keep prepared, so that, if our agreements are not kept by the nations with whom we may enter into them, we shall defend our liberty and this great fabric of free government with the lives and courage of our citizens.

We are not going to be able to trust as implicitly to some such agreement as this as we would have done but for past experience. Now let us move toward organizing the world for peace, but keep the old American gun in the forks above the door until we see clearly that the world is truly dedicated to peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives today has an opportunity to make a small gesture assuring the boys at the front that their children of today will not be called upon to fight another war 25 years from now. Had the United States, the greatest democracy in the world, entered some kind of an international set-up after World War No. 1, the prestige and edicts of this international body would have been potent and forceful and the Axis Powers would not have been permitted to construct their gigantic war machines. Furthermore, Japan would not have desecrated China; Italy would not have overwhelmed Ethiopia; and Hitler would not have possessed the Panzer divisions to conquer the smaller countries of Europe in 1939 and 1940.

This Fulbright resolution is simple, concise, and general. Its essence and meaning could be easily abbreviated to 14 words, to wit: "That the United States wants to aid in maintaining a just and lasting peace."

From the general tenor and sentiment expressed in the speeches delivered on this resolution yesterday, there is no doubt in my mind that this Congress will, by an almost unanimous vote, consent to cooperate in its afterwar mission for the future peace of the world. In just a few of the speeches yesterday did I notice the issue of partisan politics being presented in order to befog the minds of some of our Members as to the real issue involved in our after-war problems. The Members of this House must be constantly on guard that local partisan political issues be not allowed to hamper our war effort and hinder us from carrying out our sworn obligation to the millions now at the front and to future generations.

One of the blackest pages in American history was written 25 years ago when partisan politics and political hatreds

in the United States Senate brought about the defeat of the peace treaty after World War No. 1. The League of Nations set-up was not perfect, but had political hatreds been eliminated, compromises could have been brought about so that the United States could fulfill its obligation toward world peace without surrendering any of its constitutional sovereignty.

Lest we forget and that the Congress be forever diligent and on guard against the green monster of political hatreds interfering with permanent peace after World War No. 2, I would like to hereby present first-hand testimony, or as lawyers would say, "prima facie evidence," as to what happened 24 years ago.

Former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate 23 years ago, led the fight against the League of Nations. Former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, was second in command and floor leader in the senatorial fight against the League of Nations.

In 1936, Senator Watson edited a book entitled "As I Knew Them," a copy of which I received from the Congressional Library recently. On page 190, the distinguished ex-Senator reveals for the first time in public print the inside story on how the League of Nations was defeated and how Senator Lodge, at a private Sunday evening dinner in Senator Lodge's home, had revealed to him the legislative trickery and connivance that would bring about the United States' rejection of participation in the future peace of the world. I will hereby quote the exact words used by Senator Watson on pages 190 and 191 of this book:

We had not been in the contest 10 days before Senator Lodge called me over the telephone and asked me to take dinner with him that evening, Sunday. He was the majority leader at that time and was also the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a most fortunate circumstance for the Nation. At that Sunday evening dinner he said to me that, while Senator Curtis was the regular whip and would have charge of all matters pertaining to the ordinary routine of legislation, yet he wanted me as his special representative to have charge of the organization in the Senate in the League of Nations fight. He asked me to keep mum on this assignment and to report to nobody but him, to which I readily agreed. My service having been largely in the House up to that time, I had never had to deal with a treaty concerning which there was any conflict and knew little or nothing of the method of procedure in such cases.

"Senator," I said to him, "I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition. It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war and who imagine this opens a way to world peace are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it." He turned to me and said: "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations." "What do you mean by that?" I asked. "Illustrate it to me." He then went on to explain how, for instance, we would demand a reservation on the subject of submitting to our Government the assumption of a mandate over

Armenia, or any other foreign country. Senator Lodge then went on for 2 hours to explain other reservations and went into details of the situation that would be thus evolved, until I became thoroughly satisfied that the treaty could be beaten in that way.

It took the capable and convincing former Senator Lodge 2 hours to convince the equally capable Senator Watson that the League of Nations could be defeated in spite of Senator Watson's statement that 80 percent of the American people and churches favored it. As further direct evidence that partisan politics and political hatred defeated the peace after World War No. 1, I now quote from page 202 of Senator Watson's book:

Senator Borah and I have often talked it over, and both of us have said to each other frequently that the hatred of Wilson for Lodge and of Lodge for Wilson kept the United States out of the League of Nations. And there is no more doubt about it than there is that the event occurred.

Let us not again descend to the partisan levels and political battles that ruined the peace after World War No. 1.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the pending resolution and shall vote for it either in the form as originally drafted by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] or with the amendment as agreed upon by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Personally, I am unable to see wherein the language of the amendment modifies or changes the import and meaning of the original resolution in any way unless it be that the words, "constitutional processes," will assure some of our doubting Thomases that the occupant of the White House, whoever he may be, and the Congress will not participate in the establishment of appropriate international machinery to establish and to maintain the just and lasting peace in an unconstitutional manner or to repeal the Declaration of Independence and scrap the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will be a step in the right direction and will, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the spirit and morale of our soldiers who at this very hour are gallantly fighting and dying on many battle fronts to make sure of our continued freedom and independence and our American way of life and to bring peace to a war-torn world. Furthermore, the adoption of this resolution at this time will renew the courage and spirit of the enslaved peoples of the world in their life-and-death struggle to free themselves from the scourge of ruthless dictators and war lords and inspire the hope of again living in a peaceful world. It has been said during this debate that now is not the time to adopt such a resolution; that the resolution under consideration is ineffective and that it cannot serve any useful purpose at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people back home, the people who are fighting this war on the home front and who have sent their brothers, sons, and sweethearts to fight and die for their country, are tremen-

dously interested in the winning of this war in the shortest possible time and in making it possible for our boys to again be at home. They heartily approve the fine cooperative effort that the Allied Nations are putting forth to stop the march of international gangsters and murderers in their program for world conquest and domination and in their hearts they daily pray and hope that such a war, with all its destruction, misery, and suffering, will never again come to them or to their children. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our people likewise want to do everything in their power and cooperate in every possible way to make certain that in the years to come such a war as we are now engaged in will never again curse this world. If we can trust our allies to win a war, we can trust them in a cooperative effort to prevent future wars. This resolution merely expresses the feeling and sincere desire of all right-thinking people and we should let them and the world know our attitude on this all-absorbing question.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the resolution and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a group of earnest citizens met at Mackinac, representing the Republican Party, where they agreed upon and drew a set of principles which shall guide the party in the 1944 campaign, known as The Mackinac Declaration of Foreign Policy. This post-war policy for the Republican Party was adopted unanimously by the Republican Party war advisory council on September 7, 1943.

In these troublesome times, with the whole world thrown out of balance by the global war that is raging, the leaders of this party felt that it was necessary to give to the people of the Nation a tenable foundation base from which to start in an effort to bring stabilization out of economic world chaos at the close of this gigantic struggle. But in thinking of the world picture and in offering our cooperative leadership for the establishment, if possible, of world peace in the future those men and women who formed this declaration of post-war policy for the Republican Party were careful in the certainty of the language of this document to protect, first, our sovereignty, our nationalism, and, second, the general welfare of the American people. Let me quote the first three principles enumerated. They are worthy of the endorsement and careful consideration of every American.

(a) We must preserve and protect all of our national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share for a permanent peace among nations.

Then dealing again with foreign participation for the establishment of

peace we find this: The Council declares its approval of a "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace for organized justice in a free world." The declaration further sets out, in substance, that in the consideration of any post-war policy that the United States of America should adhere to such a policy as will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights as administered through our form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk, for many months, of world peace after this war is over. The hope of world peace caused leaders of the Republican Party to assemble and give thought and utterance to this document which, in my judgment, is a great and unselfish declaration of statesmanship. It is probably the most important declaration that has or will be given to the Nation of this decade. It is my belief that on these sound principles the people of the Nation will establish prevailing wise and enduring foreign policy for the future, in the hope of attaining their ultimate hope for world peace and at the same time preserving their national sovereignty.

Looking in this direction and because, to a large extent, the Fulbright resolution fairly well follows through in this line of thought for world peace, I have decided to vote for it. I wish that it were more definitely written and that it guarded with a little more certainty our constitutional safeguards. I am aware that this resolution is mostly a test of sentiment in the House and I feel certain that the Senate, which body in the future must ratify any peace commitments, will clarify its language with added constitutional safeguards which may or may not be necessary according to interpretation placed on the resolution.

It is to be hoped that the Chief Executive and others will interpret this resolution as expressing a desire of the people through their Representatives for some sort of world-peace plan, the machinery of which will later be worked out with the cooperation of the Senate with full protection for the national interests of this Nation. In fact, this resolution should serve notice on the Executive and the people and leaders of other nations that the Congress of the United States will insist on its full share and opportunity in consummating international peace terms.

Let it not be in any manner interpreted by the Executive or our multitude of dreamers and planners as a blanket endorsement of any benevolent and far-fetched or projected theories for the making of a new world order, but rather a first conservative and sensible step in the interest of our people, and I emphasize our people, in their welfare at home and world-wide.

It is to be hoped that our leaders who later shall sit at the peace table will have in mind first and at all times the interest of America. That is why we want to make certain that the constitutional rights of our people will be safeguarded. That is why we insist on the preservation of the treaty rights of the Senate. The Congress will always speak the voice of the American people.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, I spent practically all of my time in various parts of my district consulting with my constituents on the major problems confronting them and confronting Congress. In those contacts and in the speeches which I made, I was frequently asked what I thought of House Concurrent Resolution 25. I stated to my constituents, as I now state here, that I would not vote for this resolution until I was assured that it had nothing to do with a superworld government or with the sacrifice of the essential sovereignty of this country.

I am a firm believer in the fact that the United States must be one of the world leaders toward a just and lasting peace. But I am not in favor of any attempt made by certain proponents thereof to sacrifice essential sovereignty of this Nation or to lower the dignity and the effect of our Constitution and our flag.

During the discussions that have occurred on this resolution, it has been frequently stated on the floor of the House that this resolution was not a part of any scheme whereby the United States was to become a member of a superworld government, losing sovereignty thereby. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly stated that this resolution is simply a declaration of principle or of opinion by the Congress of the United States that our Nation, acting as a Nation, should do everything within its power to perfect a lasting peace. With that statement, I am in accord.

The original resolution as presented to the House was amended by the words, "through its constitutional processes." Some may argue that that amendment is innocuous, but to me it is primarily essential. The Constitution is still the fundamental law of the land, and this resolution as amended comes within the purview of the Constitution and does not in any way infringe upon it or its powers.

We owe it to our 11,000,000 men now in the military service of this country, we owe it to the fathers and mothers of those boys, and to all American citizens, and to the Nation itself to see that these global wars shall no longer occur, and that the United States shall be a definite, positive leader toward world peace.

With that thought in mind, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk lately about idealizing, whatever that may mean.

The declaration in the text of the G. O. P. report from Mackinac Island, "We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world," will be heartening to our people. It is a suggested contribution by the United States in an experiment to cure and control disease caused by world conflict.

Why should the world distrust us? For a second time we are spending our blood and treasure in wars spawned in Europe. This has been done without any previous declaration of participation on our part. We would seem already committed by our actions heretofore to do our part in a world convulsion.

A good omen has been called to my attention. Mackinac Island, Mich., furnished America's first scientific contribution to medicine in the experiments and observations carried on there in 1822 and a few years thereafter by Dr. William A. Beaumont, our pioneer in real experimentation of the physiology of digestion. His 51 inferences, all new at the time, remain 90 percent valid today. His published book is now the most prized of medical Americana.

My friend seems to see this good omen in the pledging of our part in contributing toward the determination of the causes and cure of war.

The Fulbright resolution is only a statement of our purpose to take part. No blueprint is attached. I commend your careful reading of the clear statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. My personal appreciation to him for that contribution. It ought to clear the muddy waters stirred by our fears and prejudiced opinions. This nonpartisan decision to pass this resolution is most heartening and should surely give notice to the world that we are not politically divided in our good intentions, at least. It was wise, indeed, to add the amendment to the original resolution. Such declaration should make our Vice President and others ponder before making further commitments.

We desire greatly to help those nations who may be willing to help themselves. To carry liberty and freedom to all of them is impossible. Many are far from ready to receive it. We, ourselves, are giving up our own freedom at a rapid pace and allowing bureaucratic government to dictate under the guidance of an emperor, whatever his nomenclature. After this war is over we must reclaim our liberties, or the world will have but little confidence in our own abilities to preserve them.

Hundreds of blueprints are sent us with urgent requests for their consideration and adoption. We cannot build until the site is secure. A dream house is the only kind now possible. We will for about the first time determine a question of foreign policy. Heretofore such a policy has been weak or entirely lacking. I spoke on this in this forum on November 11 in an address entitled

"Stop! Look! and Listen!" I wish I had the time to repeat some of those statements, and particularly recall statements made by others during the discussion at that time. I believe that an alliance of the English-speaking people will certainly come out of this struggle. Great Britain cannot exist safely without us. The United States cannot live safely without Great Britain and her Commonwealths. We at least must unite for mutual protection. But let us be careful that we do not tell Poland, Hungary, and other nations that we will come to their rescue if an aggressor nation should attack them. The great Russian nation must join with us before we make such commitments. We can now only conjecture what course she will be willing to follow after her own safety is assured. I had hoped for time to make other comments but will reserve them for a later time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now pending before us—Fulbright resolution—has been variously interpreted by various speakers. It is inevitable that any resolution worded in such general terms should be subject to different interpretations, but even though such variations are bound to exist, the value of the resolution remains unimpaired. The United States has assumed a position of tremendous importance in world affairs. Its own selfish interests require it to maintain this position in the future. In a world where changes are developing with extraordinary rapidity, the constitutional spokesmen for this country, namely, the President and the Secretary of State, cannot speak with validity for the Nation unless they have some assurance from the Congress of the United States with respect to the major matter of policy which this resolution covers, namely, cooperation with other nations to preserve, by force if need be, a just and lasting peace.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs deserves tremendous credit for its unanimous, nonpartisan action in initiating this resolution. The statesmanlike explanation of the resolution by its original sponsor, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative FULBRIGHT, states very clearly what, in his opinion at least, the resolution purports to do, and even more important, what it does not purport to do. I subscribe fully to the sentiments which he has expressed. From a personal experience, which included sitting through the peace conference after World War No. 1 and seeing commitments made which were later repudiated, I have the profound conviction that this Nation cannot properly take its place among the great nations of the world, its leaders cannot speak for it with authority, unless the Congress has done its share as exemplified by the measure now before us. Uncertainty and floundering with respect to our future course would relegate us to a negative and minor role in world affairs.

No American can contemplate such a role with equanimity. I therefore hope that the vote which this resolution receives today will be construed as notice to the world that in the matter of the vital interests of this Nation in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we can proceed on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, America at war is a nation fighting also for peace. The passage of the Fulbright resolution will be a fundamental approach to the problem of world collaboration with other nations. It does not matter so much to the American people whether this declaration of intent comes from the House of Representatives in the first instance or from the Senate of the United States. Our citizenry does place upon us today the grave and inescapable responsibility of acting with courage, not only for our own Republic but for our relationship when peace has come again.

It was my privilege a few days ago to talk to Pvt. Maurice Eumans, a Washington, D. C., lad of 21 years. He had lost his leg fighting in Guadalcanal. Any bitterness in his own heart for the affliction which had been wrought to his own body was dissipated in his hopeful expression to me that never again could this country or the peoples of the earth be plunged into a terrible conflict.

May I say with humility, but with all seriousness, to the Members of this body that when we consider what we shall do today on this subject matter we certainly should do it with the clear thought in mind that the sovereignty of America must be preserved. The expressions of men and women on both sides of the aisle in this debate has clearly shown that we should, and rightfully can, expect Great Britain, Russia, and other nations when they come to the terms of practical peace, to think, first of all, from the standpoint of their own nationalities and the people within. So today, without effort of suspicion in what we are doing, I ask you to think deeply about the responsibility of remembering that the best interests of America and the world will be served if we approach that problem of peace, keeping in mind always that we are Americans and that we must preserve the identity of this land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us appreciate the very serious responsibility that confronts this House in dealing with the general terms and provisions of this resolution. Personally, upon so tremendous an issue, I want to disagree with the theory on which such a resolution is being brought to us under a gag rule, under so limited a time as 4 hours for debate, and that we take or leave the expressions of a single committee of this House, all without chance of amendment.

I shall also exercise the right of a Representative to express my own opin-

ion on a resolution involving the hopes and the petitions and the prayers of the people that we represent on this most important question.

I find some difficulty myself in reconciling the ringing terms of unconditional surrender with the broad, general terms of this resolution. I find myself in disagreement with the theory of those who have spoken for this resolution that it will end all wars, because such a statement is so contrary to the human relationships and human history that I am not particularly impressed with that type of an argument.

I do feel that it would be well for us to consider the fact that this is a problem on which the Senate of the United States will write such terms and such resolutions as it sees fit. I have in mind that those who are in this House will have little to say about the terms of peace when it comes; and what the terms of peace will be, will be shaped by many elements—all of which will affect our post-war world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman know of any other country or of any other legislative body in which a similar resolution is pending at this time?

Mr. O'HARA. There has been none that I know of and none that has been acted upon by any other country of the world.

I appreciate that this problem has a tremendous appeal to the sentiments and emotions of the people of this country, but is there any other country that has longed for peace any more than this country?

Mr. Speaker, I have a most profound respect for those who have expressed themselves in debate on the Fulbright resolution. I feel deeply the heavy responsibility which rests not alone upon us, but alike upon the peoples of the world to provide the machinery for the establishment of international machinery, or whatever name you may call it, in an effort to establish and maintain peaceful relationships one with the other.

I protest that so all-important a question as we are debating should be limited under a gag rule and be so limited an allotment of time, which prevents the expression of the will of the people through us as their representatives, in expressing what may be a composite wish of our people of the United States. The result is that we are handed a vague generality by a committee and told to "take it or leave it."

I have listened to the flagellants who wear the hair shirts and beat their breasts charging us, the people of the United States, with being responsible for this war.

I have as much at stake upon this question as any individual Member of the House. I am but one of many who serve in this House who gave years in the last war, and who have sons in this war.

We are a melting pot of the peoples of the world, and as a consequence we are a conflict of human emotions and blood ties with every country in the world.

We are entitled to express our views, which are the views of our people. That is both a duty and a responsibility.

This resolution will not end wars. The enforcement of this resolution means the death of men of this country upon the face of the earth and the hollow promise that this is something to end all wars is a vagary which disregards the appealing slogan of the last war and blatantly disregards the history of the human race.

Let us be frank and honest in the discussions of these matters, and not haul out false hopes and false ideals. Let us be practical.

No matter how lofty our ideals and our desires and petitions may be for a just and lasting peace, it will be first the representatives of our Government who will make that peace, influenced by all of the uncertainties that lie ahead.

Have you ever tried to be friendly as a neighbor with a neighbor who did not want to be friendly? Was there ever anything so lofty and altruistic in ideals as the League of Nations? And why did the League of Nations fail?

Who permitted Mussolini to attack the barefoot tribes of Ethiopia? Who permitted the Japs to take over Manchuria? What outside selfish interest financed Hitler?

What do all of these things add up to? Was there ever anything so unselfish as the part and the price we paid and the sacrifices we made in World War No. 1? Are there any peoples upon the face of the earth who are as anxious for a just and a lasting peace as the people of this country? What will be the attitude of the other peoples, both our allies and the Axis Powers, toward this new world order? What will their post-war aims be?

Let us not be flagellants. Let us not be hysterical. Let us be sane, sensible, just, and, above all things, let us remember that our views will be respected by some only by our own strength.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on our side of the Foreign Affairs Committee I wish to express my sincere regret that I could not lengthen these moments so as to give all the Members who wish to speak all the time they desired.

I would like to be permitted now to yield myself the balance of the time on this side, as a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly grateful for two recent experiences that have come to me unsought, and which have stirred my mind to its depths and encouraged my heart as to the part which my own country is preparing to play in the world.

The first experience was during the first week of this month at Mackinac Island, in Michigan. Over 100 citizens, representing a cross section of the finest

people in this country—even if they were Republicans, as will be admitted, I hope, by all sides—met at that historic island. They came there for the purpose of developing the principles which must underlie our national foreign policy in the post-war period. Each one of these citizens exercising the inalienable rights and prerogatives of every free American had personal convictions which they were prepared to assert and defend. In a few days I witnessed one of the most amazing transformations that has ever come to my attention. There developed an unconscious spiritual unification of thought in the interest of our beloved country and our responsibility to the world which made possible the far-visions and unanimous principles decided on by the council. On September 6 a committee of six, on which I had the honor, with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton], met. It took us 6 hours to draw up a declaration of our position. We received much personal testimony. We examined over a hundred communications, and we ended in absolute unanimity of thought and purpose upon a policy which, I believe, will be an event of fundamental importance in the history of our country, and which I hope will be adopted by both of our major political parties.

Among other things, we came to these conclusions as to our post-war foreign policy:

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

I came from the Mackinac Conference to take my place as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. We have, I think, 12 Republicans and 13 Democrats on this committee. The membership is not arranged quite as a Republican would like it, but that is how it stands; and we drew up the resolution which is before this House now. We were unanimous; yet we received the delightful compliment here today that this resolution is "a mess of pious platitudes." My God. If your committee has sunk to that level, what about the rest of you?

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that this House recognized its responsibility and dignity in handling its affairs; and when one of your great committees, composed of intelligent, patriotic, and industrious men and women, make a report to you its conclusions ought to receive rational and courteous consideration.

Mr. Speaker I am for this resolution, not because it will solve all our problems,

not because it fixes a detailed foreign policy; I am for it, first, because it is in full accord, so far as it goes, with the policy that we devised at Mackinac Island.

Secondly, I am for it because, at least, it places the House of Representatives in its proper place as a constitutional and recognized and authoritative portion of our Government.

And, lastly, I am for it because it will have a salutary effect upon the public opinion of the world as to the place America will hold in the processes of construction after we have spent billions of dollars and thousands of the precious lives of our people in the process of destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer for a moment to the problem of sovereignty. Through the years I have had to give some attention to that particular subject, not as a lawyer but simply as a humble student. Where did sovereignty originate? When the first human being was separated from the other animals, way back in the prehistoric dawn of time, he found refuge for himself in some cave. He had no fire, no weapons, no language. He was just a trifle above the other animals, but he was possessed of the most eternal principle common to all animate nature, the desire for self-preservation. That was the beginning of the doctrine of sovereignty; that is where it resides today: the desire for self-preservation.

By and by, as man grew in intelligence, he became organized into rudimentary societies, and then there emerged something new. As this primeval animal became more human, something known as reason, and justice and responsibility, was evolved, and there emerged in rudimentary form the thing we call law. By and by man was organized into communities, and those communities were made possible because he could substitute law in defense of his desire to perpetuate himself in the place of physical force. In the beginning all he had was his club and his muscle, but now he had law.

Accordingly, as he developed he came to accept the authority of moral law in the activities of his little community, and at last as history grew, we, the descendants of the cave man, have a whole civilization resting upon law for the solution of disputes and problems, rather than upon physical force.

That shift from brute force to law took place among individuals and we did away with dueling. That shift took place place among communities, and by and by there emerged on this continent the greatest experiment in social progress based upon law the world has ever seen. If you want to know the whole story of sovereignty, study the history of your own country. We have now 48 sovereign States, and the sovereignty of those States is completely manifested in their sovereign action in delegating a part of their power and authority to a central body known as the Government of the United States.

A couple of generations ago some of our States decided to change over from an appeal to law to an appeal to force in doing what they felt they had a perfect

right to do. That was one of the great calamities that befell our system, but it convinced us that an appeal to physical force was always a failure for human beings when they could appeal to recognized and just law.

Mr. Speaker, the problem that confronts mankind today is the last group of communities in the world which still retains the cave-man system of self-preservation by appeal to physical force rather than to law. That group is the family of nations, strange as it may seem, and the problem that is emerging out of this war is the necessity for the family of nations to do what the States of the American Union have done; to do what the British Commonwealth of Nations has done: Establish law in the place of physical force.

That will not come at once. These little resolutions of ours will pass out of the picture—so will we. Our progress toward the light will be very slow. We must by trial and error build up a system of international law expressing the best moral sense and the widest intelligence of the peoples of the world. In the leadership of that great achievement stand a people who for a longer period than any other have practiced as best they knew the principles and ideals of civilized human beings: The English-speaking races.

Study your Declaration of Independence and the last paragraph of that immortal document will be a revelation when its light is turned on this resolution we are considering today. It will take a hundred years or more to establish the family of nations on a civilized basis and keep them from going back to the cave-man theory of sovereignty, but we are headed that way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman from New York, my honored colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I could not sit down without expressing the most solemn and secret and powerful ideal of my life. I believe in the Christian religion even though I do not practice it very well. The Christian religion is the first and only universal philosophy the world has ever had. Jesus Christ came to save all mankind because they were children of God, their common Father. In His ideal of the kingdom of God He found place for every human being in every land to fulfill the possibilities of His own nature, and He furnished that universal ideal of His kingdom with a social law that would make it possible for these people to live together in peace and cooperate for their own interests and the interests of all. That law is the Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule. To make sure that men could and would accept the Golden Rule He gave to each individual the power to reconcile with that law his own inner warring nature, his will, his judgment, his conscience, and his intelligence.

So I end as I have ended many times, to ask you, dear men and women and all my fellow citizens, to have faith. This is still God's world.

Have faith, men and women, in yourselves and in each other as divine beings. Have faith in your country, the fairest that God has ever given to the sons of man. Have faith in His eternal and divine purpose to bring the human race at last into a civilization that rests upon law, justice, goodness, and truth, and banish forever to the jungle the hateful passions of the tiger.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have known the author of this resolution from his boyhood; longer, perhaps, than any other Member of the House, and my knowledge of his high purposes and his keen understanding of world problems gave me an initial assurance that the resolution represented a sound approach to the establishment of a foreign policy.

I know what is in the mind of my colleague from Arkansas in urging the adoption of this resolution. You can be sure there are no undisclosed objectives. He has always believed in the direct method of doing things. When he played football at the University of Arkansas, he was distinguished not by sensational style of playing but by his direct action. If he found a hole in the line, and he seemed very adept at doing that, he went straight through it. His punting was effective, not so much because the punts were longer, but because he knew how to place them. The ball went where he meant it to go.

So, with this resolution, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wants to say what I believe the overwhelming majority of us think should be done, namely, to banish all doubt about our Nation's policy in the post-war world. The passage of this resolution will lay the foundation for the kind of international cooperation that the American people favor.

I saw the beginning of this war. I was a student in Washington when the Senate debate over the Versailles Treaty was in progress, and I listened to the final roll call from the gallery. I was one of the discouraged observers that day, because I felt we were doomed to disappointment in placing our hopes for permanent peace in any kind of arrangement except action in concert with like-minded people in other parts of the world. It is not to place the blame for this war upon our own country to suggest that things might have been different if a vigorous policy of international cooperation had been adopted at the end of the First World War. We can only speculate on that point. The spiritual elements so essential to the maintenance of peaceful relations have seemed lacking in the policies of other powers, but now that there is everywhere evidence of conversion to a better plan, do we want the responsibility in America of withholding cooperation when it might prove very costly?

This resolution involves no commitment that we cannot cheerfully subscribe to. It does not foreclose the determination of economic policies. It does not surrender sovereignty. It does not invite

the establishment of a superworld state, but it does signify the intention of this Nation to work with all peace-loving people in a united plan for peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day in the history of our country. Today we propose to pass a resolution which serves notice to the world that when we have won this war we shall try to keep it won. Never before has such action been taken by Congress. The resolution known as the Fulbright resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

We are fighting this war to prevent defeat and subjugation of our country by foreign powers. But we are fighting for even more than that. We must win the war, but we must also keep it won. Those two things must be ever present in our minds. In my opinion, the passage of this resolution will contribute to the winning of the war and toward keeping the war won. Our action will be a message of encouragement to our men in uniform, to their parents, and to freemen everywhere.

The American people do not want another World War. They are not sure of the exact procedure to follow in seeking to prevent future wars, but they propose to win this war and try to the utmost of their ability to keep it won. That was the attitude which I found among the Texas people this summer.

This resolution within itself will not prevent future war. I do not think it possible to banish war from the earth forever. But this generation has already experienced two wars. If we cannot eliminate war forever, we can postpone the day of future war for as long a period as possible. In doing so, we can save million of lives and give a ray of hope to all mankind. We may fail; I hope we shall not. We must not. I want my voice and my vote recorded among those who are doing what they can to help win this war and keep it won.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of gratification to me, and I am sure to the millions who have sons and relatives in the service, that the Congress is giving thought to a peace commensurate with the sacrifice involved in this fight for our freedom and approaching the problem as it should be approached, in a nonpartisan manner. For the first time in many years a House committee has acted unanimously on a declaration dealing with foreign policy. Personally, I would like to see this resolution adopted by as large majority as was given to our declaration of war because both are of the same general pattern. We declared war because there

was no other means of preserving our freedom. The winning of that war, at the present time, is of course the paramount aim of our foreign policy and the paramount aim of our allies. But as our distinguished Secretary of State so aptly said on September 12:

If there is anything on which all right-thinking people are agreed, it is the proposition that the monstrous specter of a world war shall not again show its head. The people of this and other lands voice this demand insistently. There is danger in complacency and wishful thinking. The nations that stand for peace and security must now make up their minds and act together—or there will be neither peace nor security.

It is abundantly clear that a system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found.

After making due allowance for the shortsightedness and selfishness of democratic nations, including our own, the fact remains that the chief threat in modern times to world security has been the warlike attitude of two aggressor nations—Germany and Japan. It is not just the military leaders of those nations, it is the rank and file of the people of those nations who have endorsed the philosophy that might makes right and that a nation is justified in taking by force anything it is able to take in that manner. If that be true, and I do not think it can be successfully contradicted, our job will not end with the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan. We must render them impotent to start another world war and keep them impotent until we are satisfied a generation has been born in Germany and Japan with a new conception of common decency and a new philosophy of life. Working, therefore, within the framework of our own best interest we will need friends and allies to do the job that lies ahead, namely, to win a peace that will be lasting as well as just.

Woodrow Wilson was more than a scholar in politics, more than a successful leader in a great war effort; he was a man with a broad vision and a great soul. He was convinced that those who died in World War No. 1 for the preservation of our democratic institutions will have died in vain unless in the post-war era our Nation agreed in a suitable and appropriate manner to cooperate with other democratic nations to preserve the peace of the world. Whether or not his plan known as the League of Nations would have accomplished that purpose will never be known because without our participation the program was doomed to failure from the start. In the Presidential election of 1920 this Nation, by an overwhelming vote, turned down the Wilson plan for world peace and decided to take its chances on a policy which, for lack of a more appropriate name, may well be called a policy of isolation. We know that policy cost us dearly. Germany, the aggressor nation in 1914, be-

came the aggressor nation again in 1938. The principal democracies of the world in their weakness and in their aversion to war as the arbitrament of international differences futilely attempted a policy of appeasement. Our Nation warned Germany and our Nation warned Japan, but to no avail, because both Germany and Japan well knew those warnings, at the moment, would not and could not be implemented by force. Germany and Japan both well knew that the oceans on which some in this country relied for protection were but avenues of approach and they likewise knew we had no long-range bombers nor protection against long-range bombers. While Japan struck first, it was really a concerted blow by Germany and Japan. Axis Powers were convinced we could be knocked out before we had an opportunity even to defend ourselves, much less carry the war to them.

As I have indicated, we have attempted a policy of going it alone and with disastrous consequences. To return after this war to that same policy would simply be suicidal. To attempt to maintain our present military strength in the post-war era would be a back-breaking burden and even then we could not hope single-handedly to defeat the whole world or even a major part of it. The alternative, therefore, is to have friends who will cooperate with us and with whom we will cooperate in a lasting peace. Every individual knows the truth of Emerson's statement—"He who hath a thousand friends hath not one to spare." And every individual knows that to have friends you must be a friend. Nations are but the aggregate of the individuals that compose them and to have friends among foreign nations we must at least indicate a desire on our part to be a friend. That desire is well expressed in the pending Fulbright resolution which declares one of our war aims to be a just and lasting peace and one of our post-war foreign policies to cooperate with other nations which share those sentiments.

Recently we dedicated at Staunton, Va., an Army general hospital to the memory of Woodrow Wilson and for the use of those broken and crippled in World War No. 2. We will provide ample hospitalization for the veterans of this conflict. We will provide money payments for veterans who survive the ordeal and pensions for the dependents of those who do not. But as Walter Lippmann recently pointed out in a striking article, there is but one currency in which those who die for honor can be paid and that is the currency of honor. Those of us who served in World War No. 1 have sons and relatives serving in World War No. 2, although we were told in the spring of 1917 we were to go forth to battle not only to preserve our democracy but likewise to prevent another similar attack upon it. The body of one who died in that conflict was brought home and interred in our national cemetery and over his grave was inscribed, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." But his story was graven only on stone; the ideal for which he fought and for which

he died was repudiated. While our men still fight on far-flung battle fronts and untimely graves are being dug in every corner of the earth I want this Congress to send to them the message that this time our boys will not die in vain and that when we bury the body of an unknown soldier of World War No. 2 in our national cemetery we can engrave upon his sepulchre the words of Pericles:

So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, with visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, while I have at all times been in favor of this resolution, I have been criticised by some for withholding action on it by the Committee on Rules. Yes, I admit that I have not called a meeting of the Committee on Rules to take action on the resolution in reporting out a special rule for its consideration because I wanted to ascertain that its passage would be certain when it would be acted upon by the House. Knowing that a recess would take place, I felt that the members should have an opportunity to obtain the views of their constituents on this question. For many months a vast majority of the American people have urged that Congress go on record that our country favors a world-wide agreement that will bring about the complete disarmament of the Nazi-Japanese barbarians in order to safeguard our country and the world democracies from future wars and to work out a common sense plan that will insure permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, in compliance with that universal demand the Committee on Foreign Affairs after due consideration reported the Fulbright resolution, which reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Congress has now returned after a 10 weeks' recess and the Members, having obtained the reaction and views of their constituency, know that the people are in favor of this resolution, and I feel that they will vote in accordance with the wishes of the people they represent. The leaders of the House after a conference, came to the conclusion that instead of passing the resolution by a mere majority vote that the bill should be considered under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote, and also agreed to increase the customary time of 40 minutes that is permitted for gen-

eral debate, to 4 hours. On the vote on the resolution to consider the Fulbright resolution 252 members voted aye, and 23 Republicans voted nay. The vote took place after an attack against the resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the two gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. BRADLEY]. These three gentlemen and the 20 of the 23 who voted against the resolution to consider have generally opposed and voted against nearly all bills for the preparedness and war program, against appropriations for the fortification of Guam and other bases, against lend-lease, against the amendment of the Neutrality Act, the conscription and draft acts, the Stabilization Act, and others. From their votes in opposition to these and other measures it cannot be said that they have cooperated in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, it was indeed gratifying how well the President's message of a few days ago was received by the membership of the House and the country. Only a few isolationists and appeasers imbued with Nazi-Fascist ideology or influenced by the propaganda of George Sylvester Viereck—the now convicted Hitler-Goebbels paid agent—did not approve the President's honest résumé of our achievements and accomplishments since the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

I insert at this point an excerpt from an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of September 15, 1943, entitled "G. O. P. Put on Record for Council of Nations." It is as follows:

Joliet, Ill., September 15.—Deneen A. Watson, National Chairman of the Republican Postwar Policy Association, said September 13 that the recent declaration of the Republican leaders at Mackinac Island "stands as a pledge for a definite world organization and a world court to adjudicate international disputes."

Long before the Mackinac Island Conference the Republicans promised to cooperate in our war efforts. I am not going to charge that the Republicans whom I have mentioned are unpatriotic and that they continue to play into Hitler's hands. Many of those who, like them, up to the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, opposed defense and preparedness measures and criticized administration policies, have desisted from their attacks, but we still have a handful who unfortunately seem to follow the George Sylvester Viereck propagandist agents and professional publicists and carry on subversive activities such as is disseminated by men like William Dudley Pelley, Gerald L. K. Smith, Merwin K. Hart, William J. Grace, James True, Edward James Smythe, Gerard B. Winrod, Edward Holton James, Lawrence Dennis, William Griffin, Col. Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, Mrs. Leslie Fry, George E. Deatherage, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, Robert Edward Edmondson, and others.

Do they not realize their responsibility to the country and to the millions of our boys at the front, of whom over a hundred thousand have already been killed, wounded, and disabled, or reported missing in action? Surely the President's message should have instilled the utmost

confidence as to the conduct of the war and have shown his great desire to safeguard the United States and the freedom and liberty which our Constitution guarantees to us. I am at a loss for words to appeal to this handful of gentlemen to desist from their attacks and fault-finders which encourage the Nazi-Fascist hirelings, not only in their subversive but seditious activities, but to continue in their organizing of dubious societies under patriotic names and to publish un-American magazines and pamphlets in the hope of creating discord and resentment and inciting racial hatred and destroy our unity.

Mr. Speaker, I have been all my life for the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, as well as freedom in religious worship, but these professional publicists and propagandists whom I have mentioned, are abusing those privileges, and, while many of them have been indicted and convicted for conspiracies and seditious activities, those who up to now have escaped apprehension, still continue in their subversive activities. I feel that this handful of Representatives here owe it to the country and to themselves to cease feeding and encouraging these Benedict Arnolds and Quislings in their dastardly work.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the heroic work on the part of 180,000,000 Russian people in aiding the United Nations to defeat the Nazi-Jap war lords, I feel that it is deplorable that some should continue in their criticism. Instead the Russian people are entitled to the plaudits of all liberty-loving peoples the world over. Not being able to hide the atrocities of the Hitler hordes, by their shouting and ranting over communism, they now seek to bring about friction and discord among the United Nations by charging that Russia contemplates a separate peace with Hitler and that it cannot be trusted in the post-war program. It seems to me—and I hope I am wrong—that these members are trying to follow in the footsteps of those responsible for our failure to enter the League of Nations and who thus made it possible for Hitler and the Japs to rearm and, therefore, upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for this war and the loss of thousands of our boys and at a staggering cost to our country of billions and billions of dollars. There are some persons in our country who feel themselves secure in continuing their subversive activities, but I assure them that in the long run the truth will out and overtake them.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution and shall vote for it. The limitation on the time of debate, with preference given to the members of the committee, forces me to be brief. It requires the vote of both the House and Senate to declare war, and that is what this body did on December 8, 1941. It is neither unconstitutional or improper for this House to declare for peace and express its determination to do everything possible to set up proper ma-

chinery for international cooperation, to the end that there shall be no more wars. This resolution does not invade the treaty-ratifying powers of the Senate. It is not even a blueprint and sets up no specific formula. I am sure, however, it voices my own conviction, and that of the people I have the honor to represent, that we should at least take the first step now to let our allies know we will join hands with them to see to it that in the future war aggressor nations will be stopped before they get started. This resolution, I am sure, expresses the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the American people. It will be a message to our boys on every war front in the world that they are not fighting in vain. I am one of those who believe if Woodrow Wilson had realized his dream and hope, we would not now be in this war. I believe it would be very heartening not only to our allies but to all the people in our own country if when the roll is called the vote for the resolution would be unanimous.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the midst of the greatest crisis in her history. We have a twofold task. One is the immediate task of checking the reign of terror let loose by the Axis throughout the world. There is no possibility of there ever again being a decent, orderly, peaceful world, with security for ourselves, unless there is a complete defeat of the things that Japanese militarism and Hitlerism represent. But we can get that defeat, as we did once before, and still not get the decent world.

Victory over the enemy is prerequisite, but victory in itself does not touch the solution of our larger problem. It only gives us a chance to solve that problem.

And what is the problem? Basically, it is just this, very simple and very difficult—the peoples of the world learning to live together. That is the long-term task. We must help build new relationships between nations, and new techniques for solving their disputes, so that this sort of thing cannot happen every 25 years. To do that we must achieve with our allies a long-term collaboration and teamwork.

What kind of a world do we want? I think that if we examine our own minds and desires carefully, we will say the two things the majority of Americans want, most of all, are prosperity and security. Can we get either of those objectives just by our own effort without regard to the rest of the world?

Let us consider first prosperity. In order to furnish food and supplies for ourselves, our men on dozens of battle fronts, our allies, and hungry millions being liberated from Axis tyranny, we have been forced to build up in America productive capacity far in excess of what we at home can consume, or at least more than we can buy and pay for. After the war we will be left with an enormously overbuilt plant, agricultural and industrial. We must then either drastically reduce our plant to what we can consume, which would mean putting millions of men and women out of

work at the very time soldiers are being demobilized and we need several million more, not fewer, jobs; or, we must find new markets for our surplus productive capacity. There are only two places to develop such new markets—at home and abroad.

We must be planning now to multiply jobs by building up in every possible way new industries and markets here at home. But with all the expansion possible, the American market simply cannot be enough to keep the American farmer and manufacturer and laborer at full employment. We must, therefore, lay long-range plans to increase our markets abroad.

America can exist by herself alone, even as a farmer can exist by himself. He can grow enough grain, vegetables, chickens, hogs, sheep, and so forth, to feed and clothe himself and his family; but he cannot develop a high standard of living, he cannot secure modern conveniences, he cannot develop a satisfying social and cultural life without trade and cordial relations with his neighbors. Wealth and prosperity come from exchange of commodities on a mutually beneficial basis; and rich culture and civilization come from interchange of ideas and personalities.

But there is no possibility of such trade and interchange between nations, and therefore no possibility of long-term economic prosperity here in America, unless there is political security throughout the world. One cannot enter into a contract with a firm in a foreign land unless there is reasonable certainty that goods can go and come, and that media of exchange will be stable, and that war or revolution will not be breaking out.

That brings us back to the other major objective—security. That is the fundamental problem—how can we get security? How can we preserve the peace after we have won it? How can we prevent these periodic outbreaks of increasingly violent, and costly, and disastrous wars?

In all history there have been but three types of security. The first was by individual armaments. Every man on our plains carried a gun on his hip. But it did not give him adequate security, because two or three others could always gang up against him.

Therefore, he went to the second stage—the stage of alliances. The cattle thieves, and horse rustlers, and highwaymen were allied in gangs. Therefore, the law-abiding citizens had to form alliances also. They were not ideal. They led at times to perversions of justice, to vigilante groups, to lynch law. But on the whole, they gave a greater degree of security than just individual armaments. It was the balance-of-power system.

Then our forefathers, as the country became more thickly settled and society became more complex, were wise enough to proceed to the third stage—that of organized security. If a man wanted to be sure that his family had a maximum of security with a minimum cost of his own time and money, the way to do it was to join with his neighbors in organizing the community to make sure there would be

clean water for all, and good sewage disposal, and good schools, good highways, good public health, and a good police force.

It was not because he was more interested in his neighbor's wife than in his own that he recognized it was part of his business to see that the neighbor's wife was safe and secure. It was only because he could not be sure of his own wife's safety unless he helped build a community orderliness which would make every law-abiding person in the area reasonably secure. Only when that had been achieved could he give up carrying his gun.

We in America tried for 20 years to get along without any one of the three. We would not go into alliances with the nations whose interests were nearest to our own. We would not join with other countries in an attempt to get organized security. And then we gave up our gun. No wonder we are fighting for our lives.

We allowed ourselves to be deluded by the fact that our country, until recent decades, was able to get security by physical separation from the rest of the world. Nature gave us two wide oceans, but we ourselves destroyed them with our own inventions. It was we, not the Germans or Japanese, who invented the steamboat, the submarine, and the airplane. We ate up the cake of our physical isolation with our own inventions, and still thought we had it. We jammed ourselves into the same boat with the rest of the world, and assumed that the boat could sink, but that by some magic we remain afloat.

Sometimes I wish we had a planet all by ourselves. Wouldn't that be fine? And yet I know what we would do, being Americans. We would lie awake at night until we could think up some way to get across from that planet to this one, so we could start doing business with the people here. And then we would wonder why we no longer had the security that came from separation.

No, to try to stand alone in this jungle of a world is to be overwhelmed. How then can we get security? Only by working with other peoples of like mind to achieve in full, frank cooperation agreement as to the rules and procedures by which life and intercourse on this planet are to be conducted. They must be agreements that will be to the benefit of all parties concerned, and therefore will serve the vital interests of each. Otherwise, we cannot expect the agreements to be adhered to faithfully either by others or by ourselves.

The resolution under consideration today makes clear to the world that we of both political parties realize this situation and want to do our utmost to work out if possible such mutually beneficial rules and procedures. It recognizes fully that we in this House do not have the authority to make binding commitments in our foreign relations. It recognizes that the machinery set up in our Constitution for making treaties and binding commitments with other nations is a partnership—the Executive and the United States Senate. Any contract entered into by only one partner

without the full consent of the other cannot, of course, be binding. We have not forgotten, and neither have our allies—nor our enemies—that President Wilson once made some commitments which had not been agreed upon in advance by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and by both political parties, and which, therefore, were rejected. How can we expect a President to negotiate with other nations without handicap, or expect those nations to negotiate freely and frankly with him, if they are not sure what the other partner, the Senate, will do?

Why should anyone expect Mr. Stalin to lay his cards on the table and perhaps reach an agreement with us, when he knows that an agreement has no validity from our standpoint until ratified by the Senate? How can leaders of other nations plan intelligently with us if they have no assurance as to what the foreign policy of the United States will be after 1944?

It has been said here that we cannot make plans for the future because we do not know what Churchill's plans, or Stalin's plans, or other nations' plans are. As a matter of fact, we do know pretty well what their basic ideas are. We may not agree with some of those ideas, but they have made fairly clear what they consider their vital interests to be. We should be as frank. Until we do, we, not they, are the great question mark in the world.

Do we want to compel them to make their own plans for the post-war world without us? Does anyone believe a settlement as good for us can be reached by them without us?

Therefore, we are saying in this resolution that we in this House believe that our vital national interests require that the President and two-thirds of the Senate—and that means both political parties, too—seek to reach a basic agreement on a sound, continuing, national foreign policy. It must be neither Democratic nor Republican, but American—just as the Monroe Doctrine has always been American. The whole world has known for over a hundred years, that, no matter who was President of the United States, or what party was in power, we would not stand for any foreign nation trying to encroach on this hemisphere.

Agreement must be reached in the next few months, before we get into the heat of the Presidential campaign, before passions are stirred up over the domestic issues about which there are such vigorous and important differences of opinion.

If the Germans know now what America's position with regard to the war and the peace will be, no matter who is elected next year, they are more likely to crack up. If they think we may be disunited on this issue, or try to withdraw from cooperation with the United Nations, then our enemies are encouraged to hang on desperately, and that means more Americans boys killed every day.

I venture to warn that if our Republican leaders are willing—as I hope and

believe will be the case—but the administration and Democratic leaders refuse to cooperate now in trying to work out a truly national, nonpartisan, continuing foreign policy and plans for post-war collaboration, then whatever settlement the Executive reaches in secret with other countries will be rejected by the Senate, and by the people, even though the agreements be as good as the Ten Commandments.

On the other hand, if the administration and the Democratic leaders are willing, but the Republican leaders refuse to cooperate in trying to work out now, before the campaign, such a truly national foreign policy, then the Republican Party will be rejected at the polls, and will deserve to be rejected—because it will have demonstrated it is not sufficiently constructive and forward looking and responsible to be entrusted with power in so critical a period.

This resolution both strengthens and restrains the President in his negotiations with our allies and with our enemies. It does not try to define now exactly what "appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace" would be. But it gives no carte blanche. It makes clear that the Senate will determine at the proper time what is or is not appropriate.

I hope its passage by an overwhelming majority will encourage the members of both parties in the Senate to advise in the near future approximately how far they will go along in international collaboration to establish and maintain the peace. The Executive's hand would be enormously strengthened in his negotiations with other nations—as long as he stays within the general framework. If he should be tempted to make commitments too far outside that general framework, both he and the other nations are forewarned that such commitments are likely to be considered inappropriate, and therefore be rejected—and he is properly restrained.

Somehow we must rise above politics and partisanship to achieve a real unity and teamwork on this vital issue, so that America and the world will know that, no matter what decision Americans make in 1944 as to how they want their domestic affairs run, our foreign policy will be realistic, stable, predictable, and continuing.

It may be objected that we would be surrendering some of our sovereignty to join in a cooperative effort to maintain the peace. Well, did we have complete sovereignty? Did we have in our own hands control of the question as to whether we went to war or not? No. Japan decided for us.

Do we have absolute sovereignty now in waging the war? No. Scores of units of our fleet are fighting under the command of British admirals. Tens of thousands of British, and French, and Greeks, and Dutch, and Chinese, and Australians, and New Zealanders are fighting under the command of American generals. Americans are fighting under the command of a Chinese general. We would not hesitate to place some of our

forces under Stalin's command if they were needed and he wanted them on the Russian front.

We recognize fully that there are risks in delegating, whether in war or peace, control of certain functions to the United Nations, but we do it, nevertheless, because we recognize that the risks in not working together in such a fashion are enormously greater.

America is in the valley of decision. Today and in these next few months we will be deciding, probably without realizing it, the basic attitudes and directions which are likely to determine the course of our Nation and of the world for the next half century. Four main choices are before us. First, we can try to go back to so-called isolationism. It once was possible, but that day has gone. The progress of invention, the ability of the airplane to disregard all land boundaries, and the refusal of other nations to ignore us, no matter how much we want to ignore them, make it an absolute impossibility.

Second, American imperialism. Some will say, "Well, if we can't escape the world, then we will rule it. If the world will not leave us alone, then we will get control of the key islands, and critical air bases, and main routes of trade, and fortify them until impregnable, and then build such a giant air force and navy and army that it will be certain no nation can ever attack us."

That sounds big; but let us examine, first, whether it is possible, and second, what the attempt would cost in men and money.

It is difficult for us Americans to realize that we are rapidly becoming a havenot nation in many crucial materials because of the rate at which we are exhausting our resources. If we try to police the world, the other nations certainly will gang up against us, just as we now gang up against those who would try to rule us. Those who are now helping supply us with tin, oil, rubber, copper, zinc, bauxite, tungsten, chromium, and so forth, would refuse us free access to their supplies of those resources which we never had or have used up.

Again, we will have a population of less than 140,000,000, a little tired and disillusioned, and asking only to be let alone. But there are 200,000,000 Russians, and they are not tired. There are 450,000,000 Chinese, just awakening from the sleep of the centuries, and their leaders are aflame with the love of human freedom as our forefathers were in 1776. Ferment is beginning to work among 375,000,000 in India, and there are 150,000,000 in Latin America, restless and uneasy. Does anybody really think we with our limited resources and manpower can run the world or police it single-handed?

To try to do it would mean that two or three millions of our sons who are now in uniform will never get back to civilian life. Do we want them to win the war only to be permanently in uniform?

It would cost 15 to 25 billion dollars for armaments in every annual budget. Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly contemplate such a permanent expenditure. Our taxes would have to go constantly higher.

We would have less and less money for the comforts of life, the things we Americans are used to and crave. That would mean increasing dissatisfaction and discontent throughout all sections of our populace. Gradually our standard of living would go down and we would either break up into factions and go the way of France—national disintegration—or some man with a hypnotic personality would come along and promise relief if we would but follow him, and the mass of people would go with him into a totalitarian system and the loss of our basic freedoms.

For America to try imperialism would be suicidal.

Third, America could try to buy the world's goodwill, by endeavoring to supply the world adequate food, clothing, medicines, and so forth, out of our own resources—the philosophy of giving people things, instead of helping them get on their feet so they can develop their own freedom-from-want. That philosophy has always been and always will be self-defeating in the long run. It destroys independence and will and initiative. Besides our Nation simply does not have the resources and money to sustain any such program.

If we cannot escape the world, or rule the world, or buy the world, is there any course left except a genuinely cooperative effort to achieve with our allies an organized security? It is not possible to settle now actual details of such organization, nor is it within the jurisdiction of the House; but if we and the other peoples of the world see, first of all that we must find some other way than war of solving our disputes, I am perfectly confident the actual appropriate machinery for doing it can be evolved.

If we are sufficiently intelligent, and wise in our own interests, to work out with our allies ways by which we can jointly win the war, then surely we are sufficiently intelligent, and wise in our own interests, to be able to work out with our allies ways by which we can jointly win the peace and jointly prevent war.

Let us, by an overwhelming vote, tell our soldiers, our people generally, our allies, and our enemies that we are dedicating ourselves today to that stern, inescapable task.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is playing its proper role in the Government when it voices the will of the people. We are here for that purpose. The people have unmistakably made known that they favor such a resolution as we are passing. They recognize the fact that the United States is vitally concerned in finding ways and means to prevent another World War. They are willing that the United States should join in the search for a method of preserving world peace.

This resolution does not prejudice the work of the conference that will follow the United Nations' victory. We are not committing the country or Congress to any peace plan. We are asking that a concerted search be made for such a plan.

Then, if a plan is evolved, and if it meets the situation and appeals to the sovereign judgment of the United States, it can be approved.

It is well that Congress should voice the will of the people on this subject. It is well for both enemies and friends to know that the United States is determined that the peace to follow this war shall be a just and lasting peace. In order to accomplish this purpose it is necessary that a search for a workable plan be made by the free nations. That is what we ask for in this resolution. It may be that this action will pave the way for universal peace. God grant that it may be so.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution as amended?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 360, nays 29, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—360

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Cooper | Graham |
| Allen, Ill. | Costello | Grant, Ala. |
| Allen, La. | Courtney | Grant, Ind. |
| Andersen, | Cox | Gregory |
| H. Carl | Cravens | Griffiths |
| Anderson, Calif. | Crosser | Gross |
| Andresen, | Cunningham | Gwynne |
| August H. | Curley | Hagen |
| Andrews | Curtis | Hale |
| Angell | D'Alesandro | Hall, |
| Arends | Davis | Edwin Arthur |
| Arnold | Dawson | Hall, |
| Auchincloss | Delaney | Leonard W. |
| Baldwin, Md. | Dewey | Halleck |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Dickstein | Hancock |
| Barden | Dies | Hare |
| Barrett | Dillweg | Harness, Ind. |
| Barry | Dingell | Harris, Ark. |
| Bates, Ky. | Dirksen | Harris, Va. |
| Bates, Mass. | Disney | Hart |
| Beall | Ditter | Hays |
| Beckworth | Domengeaux | Hébert |
| Bell | Dondero | Heffernan |
| Bender | Doughton | Hendricks |
| Bennett, Mich. | Douglas | Herter |
| Bennett, Mo. | Drewry | Hess |
| Blackney | Durham | Hinshaw |
| Bland | Dworshak | Hoch |
| Bloom | Eaton | Hoeven |
| Bolton | Eberharter | Holifield |
| Bonner | Ellison, Md. | Holmes, Wash. |
| Boykin | Ellsworth | Hope |
| Bradley, Pa. | Elston, Ohio | Horan |
| Brooks | Engel | Howell |
| Brown, Ga. | Fay | Hull |
| Brown, Ohio | Feighan | Jarman |
| Bryson | Fellows | Jeffrey |
| Buckley | Fenton | Jenkins |
| Buffett | Fernandez | Jennings |
| Bulwinkle | Fish | Jensen |
| Burch, Va. | Fisher | Johnson, Ind. |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Fitzpatrick | Johnson, |
| Burdick | Flannagan | J. Leroy |
| Burgin | Fogarty | Johnson, |
| Butler | Folger | Luther A. |
| Byrne | Forand | Johnson, |
| Camp | Ford | Lyndon B. |
| Canfield | Fulbright | Johnson, Okla. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Fulmer | Johnson, Ward |
| Cannon, Mo. | Gale | Jonkman |
| Capozzoli | Gallagher | Judd |
| Carlson, Kans. | Camble | Kean |
| Carter | Gathings | Kearney |
| Case | Gavagan | Kee |
| Celler | Gavin | Keefe |
| Chapman | Gerlach | Kefauver |
| Chiferfield | Gibson | Kelley |
| Church | Gifford | Kennedy |
| Clason | Gilchrist | Keogh |
| Cochran | Gillette | Kerr |
| Cole, Mo. | Gillie | Kilburn |
| Cole, N. Y. | Gordon | Kilday |
| Colmer | Gore | Kling |
| Compton | Gorski | Kinzer |
| Cooley | Gossett | Kirwan |

Kleberg
Kunkel
LaFollette
Landis
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lewis, Colo.
Lewis, Ohio
Luce
Ludlow
Lynch
McCord
McCormack
McCowan
McGehee
McGranery
McGregor
McLean
McMillan
McMurray
McWilliams
Maas
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Mansfield,
Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Merritt
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Morrison, La.
Morrison, N. C.
Mott
Mruk
Mundt
Murdoch
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.

Murray, Wis.
Myers
Newsome
Norman
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Pace
Patman
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Phillbin
Phillips
Ploeser
Plumley
Poage
Poulson
Powers
Pracht
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Ramey
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Rees, Kans.
Richards
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Calif.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowan
Russell
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasser
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schiffler
Schuetz
Schwabe
Scott
Shafer
Sheppard
Sheridan

Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Steagall
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stewart
Stockman
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Towe
Treadway
Troutman
Van Zandt
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Ward
Weaver
Weiss
Welch
Wene
Wheat
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Wilson
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NAYS—29

Bishop
Bradley, Mich.
Brehm
Busbey
Carson, Ohio
Clevenger
Crawford
Day
Ellis
Elmer

Gearhart
Heldinger
Hoffman
Johnson,
Anton J.
Jones
Knutson
Lambertson
Lemke
O'Brien, Mich.

Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rowe
Short
Smith, Ohio
Sumner, Ill.
Tarver
Welchel, Ga.
Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Hara
NOT VOTING—40

Anderson,
N. Mex.
Boren
Chenoweth
Clark
Coffee
Creal
Cullen
Elllott
Furlong
Goodwin
Granger
Green
Harless, Ariz.

Hartley
Hill
Hobbs
Holmes, Mass.
Izac
Jackson
Johnson,
Calvin D.
Lane
McKenzie
O'Connor
O'Konski
O'Leary
Peterson, Fla.

Pittenger
Rockwell
Sparkman
Spence
Stevenson
Sundstrom
Thomas, N. J.
Wasielewski
Welchel, Ohio
West
White
Willey
Winter
Wolcott

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willey and Mr. Sparkman for, with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson against.

Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sunstrom.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Rockwell.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Winter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 883) entitled "A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business."

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Connecticut Wholesale Milk Producers' Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS PIPE
LINES FOR STEAM-HEATING PURPOSES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3208) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, authorized and empowered to grant permission to Lansburgh & Bro., a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia and doing business in said District, and the owner of lots 819, 803, 817, and 804, square 431, all on the east side of Eighth Street NW., between D and E Streets, and lots 17, 810, and 811, square 407, all on the west side of Eighth Street NW., between D and E Streets, and all in the District of Columbia, its successors and assigns, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use pipe lines for the carriage of steam heat, together with necessary return pipes, from a point within said lot 819, square 431, across Eighth Street NW., to a point within said lot 17, square 407.

SEC. 2. That all the construction and use provided for herein shall be under such regulations and rentals as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may make and establish in connection therewith and all plans and specifications for such construction shall be subject to their approval. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have full authority to designate the location and to cause such repairs or relocation of said pipe lines as the public necessity may require, any such repairs or relocation to be at the expense of Lansburgh & Bro., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 3. That no permission granted or enjoyed hereunder shall vest any title or interest in or to the land within Eighth Street NW.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1224) to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the distinguished ranking minority member of the House District Committee, may I say to the Members that the bill S. 1224 passed the Senate unanimously. At the present time the District of Columbia Public Library does not have the right to act as a depository for public documents of the United States. This bill simply gives to the Librarian of the District of Columbia the right to receive such documents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Library of the District of Columbia is hereby constituted a designated depository of governmental publications, and the Superintendent of Documents shall supply to such library one copy of each such publication, in the same form as supplied to other designated depositories.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAILING OF ANNUAL NOTICES TO OWNERS OF TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 789) to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure also passed the Senate unanimously. It is simply a procedural bill which calls upon the tax collector of the District of Columbia to provide for the mailing of annual notices to those persons holding tax-exempt properties within the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved

December 24, 1942, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided, That such rules and regulations shall include provision for mailing annually, on or before February 1 of each year, to each of the institutions, organizations, corporations, or associations required by section 3 of this act to file annual reports, notice of its contingent tax liability under this act, together with a copy of any standard form for such reports which shall have been prescribed by the Commissioners under authority of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND SUPERINTENDENT OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1223) to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I reserve the right to object and suggest that the chairman make some explanation of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure will allow and direct an increase of salary to the two officers within the District of Columbia. The recorder of deeds for this jurisdiction would have his salary increased from \$6,400 to \$8,000 per year, and the superintendent of the National Training School for Girls would have her salary increased from \$2,700 to \$3,600 a year. It is felt that the salaries for these two public officials are not commensurate with the salaries paid for comparable work done in other positions of trust and administrative capacity in the District of Columbia. I believe I should read to the House this comment from the report which accompanies the bill in the Senate prior to its passage:

It should be made clear that this bill, so far as it relates to the recorder of deeds, concerns only the question of compensation. Another bill (S. 1251) now pending before this committee is a measure relating to the matter of the authority of the District of Columbia Commissioners over the recorder of deeds.

Then the report states this further, that it should be stated frankly that it is the opinion of the committee that the two positions which this bill concerns would pay higher salaries if filled by white incumbents, and also that it is the sense of the committee that no taint of discrimination should be attached in any way to any salaries paid in or under the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman think that these two are the only inequalities existing in the government of the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; and I would say to the gentleman as he well knows

from his services here, that there are other inequalities and inequities existing in the government of the District of Columbia. Such things exist also in the State of Kansas, as well as in my own State. The gentleman does well to call attention to the fact from time to time so that we may deal justly with those receiving less than their services should command.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of approval of this act the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, appointed in accordance with section 548 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1275), shall be paid a salary at the rate of \$8,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. From and after the date of approval of this act, and notwithstanding any provisions of the act of July 9, 1888 (25 Stat. ch. 595), or any provisions of the act of March 16, 1926 (44 Stat. ch. 58), or any provisions of any other act heretofore approved, the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls shall be paid a salary at the rate of \$3,600 per annum.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVYING AND COLLECTING OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS OF TAXES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1938, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and ask the gentleman from West Virginia to make some explanation of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this would amend the act presently in force in the District of Columbia in connection with the levying and collection of taxes and assessments. The purpose is to assure the mailing of real estate tax bills to all taxpayers whose addresses are known to the assessor's office.

In this connection I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1938, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 12. On or before August 1, 1943, and on or before the first day of August of each subsequent year, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a regular assessment has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1 of the same year, a notice of the amount of such assessment, and of the manner in which the amount of such assessment is payable according to law; and such notice shall also include notice of any previous assessments, or portions thereof, levied by the District of Columbia against such lot or parcel of land, which on July 1 of the year in which such

notice is sent remained unpaid, and of any fines or penalties accrued or levied by reason of such delinquency: *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown, such notice shall be mailed to his tenant or agent; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this Act."

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 1, strike out all of section 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. Annually and subsequent to July 1, the Assessor of the District of Columbia shall mail to the record owner of each lot or parcel of land upon which a real estate tax has been levied by the District of Columbia as of July 1, of the same year, a notice of the amount of such real estate tax, and of the manner in which the amount of such real estate tax is payable according to law; and such notice shall state whether there were any delinquent real estate taxes unpaid on July 1 of the year in which such notice is sent; *Provided*, That if the address of the owner be unknown such notice shall be mailed to his agent, if known; and if there be more than one record owner of any lot or parcel, notice mailed to one of the owners shall be deemed compliance with this section: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall affect in any way the provisions of section 3 of this act: *Provided further*, That failure of the property owner or his agent to receive such notice shall not relieve the property owner of the payment of any penalty or interest as required by law for the delinquent payment of real estate taxes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENT AND CAUSE OF ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 2553) directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearinghouse for information on methods to control absenteeism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3018, authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to embark upon the construction and opening up of new reclamation and irrigation projects without any restriction as to location or the amount of money involved. It is too important to be passed by unanimous consent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1388, to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and interests in land in the State of Tennessee for the construction of a scenic parkway to be located generally parallel to the boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and connecting with the park, in order to provide an appropriate view of the park from the Tennessee side. The right-of-way to be acquired for the parkway shall be of such width as to comprise an average of 125 acres per mile for its entire length. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. All property acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park upon acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS OR RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Interior is opposed to this measure and it is not approved by the Budget, it should not be passed by unanimous consent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GRANTING OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 340, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if any one of the objectors can give some explanation of this bill? What is the location of the land?

Mr. PRIEST. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] has explained that.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] can probably do that better than any member of this committee. He is not present in the hall at this time. If the gentleman from Washington has any serious objection he might request that the bill be passed over until the Delegate from Alaska is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

NONFAT DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 149, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, although personally in favor of the measure, in view of the fact that the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency has indicated his disapproval of the bill, I think it should be brought to the attention of the House in its entirety and not passed by unanimous consent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some explanation of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to dispense with the explanation if the bill will go through. But for many months of this session, as well as some months in the last session of Congress, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries held many hearings on matters pertaining to the fisheries industry and it became very apparent there was need of coordination.

It developed there were 22 war and other agencies that were affecting the fisheries industry very seriously, and unless there was some one agency that could attempt to coordinate those things, there would be hopeless confusion.

Personally, I appealed to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget for the establishment of a fisheries coordinator, if for nothing else than to relieve my

committee of the burden that was resting upon it, for if we had some one person to whom the fisheries could look to represent the fisheries with the various agencies, many problems could be solved.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if the committee reported the bill?

Mr. BLAND. This bill was carefully considered and unanimously reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much money is authorized to be appropriated under the bill?

Mr. BLAND. The bill authorizes the necessary appropriations, and I understand there is pending a request for about \$207,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say for the information of the House that the situation was so chaotic in Seattle in respect to fisheries that until the office was created, representatives of the industry had been down here seeking some solution; it has operated very successfully through setting up the Office of the Fisheries Coordinator.

Mr. BLAND. And they were instrumental in meeting many of the fisheries difficulties, as, for instance, there were a number of boats that had been requisitioned and were necessary for the prosecution of the fisheries. The Coordinator assisted in securing the return of some of them.

Mr. BARDEN. I might add that the feeling within the fisheries industry is that this step is one of the best contributions to the promotion of the fishery industry that has been made.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think this is too important a bill to be brought up under this kind of a rule.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I can say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is no more important bill for the fisheries industry pending before the House at this session, and I do not know of any objection that has ever been interposed to it. Every man familiar with the fisheries industry who came before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries emphasized the necessity of having some agency to which they could go and the Coordinator has established them now. I think some eleven or twelve regional areas have been established, and the fisheries generally are in touch with these agencies, and through them are getting better results. There is no complaint from the fisheries.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if this bill has been considered by the committee and if this is the result of consideration by the full committee?

Mr. BLAND. It has been considered by the committee. I do not know that I can tell the gentleman how many members were present at the time, but I will say that the things leading up to this bill have been considered by the members of the committee from time to time.

Mr. JENSEN. Has it been voted out of your committee?

Mr. BLAND. It has.

Mr. JENSEN. It has been favorably acted upon?

Mr. BLAND. It was voted out as of July 2, 1943, and the report on the bill is No. 642. There was no objection whatsoever interposed.

Mr. JENSEN. We are setting up another agency, I will say to the gentleman, are we not, under this bill?

Mr. BLAND. It is setting up what is necessary as coordination between these agencies in order that something may be accomplished. If we do not do this we are not going to get the benefits of fisheries that are necessary for them to continue the production of food that is so much needed now.

Mr. JENSEN. Will it require many employees in the Department?

Mr. BLAND. There will be need, necessarily, for some employees to carry on the work and that is covered in the appropriation that is being sought.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that our difficulty is just this: We have the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior, and I was of the opinion it was its job to coordinate the various activities, and I know nothing about the necessity for the expenditure of in excess of \$200,000 involved in the creation of the coordinators' office.

Mr. BLAND. It was very evident to the committee that the Bureau of Fisheries could not do the job that needed to be done in coordinating the 22 agencies and getting this work done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Speaking for myself, I have never been advised by Dr. Gabrielson that his agency was not doing this work.

Mr. BLAND. He is trying to do it; he is doing a splendid job.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BLAND. But certain additional force is needed and additional equipment needed in order to make contact with the 22 Government agencies with the returning of boats, supplies, and the shipping going up to Alaska; there is additional work incident to the war agencies in connection with some of the products that are needed and that could be loaded, and there is need for personal contact in order to do that work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, of course, if additional appropriations were made to Fish and Wildlife they might very conceivably handle this job without the necessity of creating another agency.

Mr. BLAND. The agency is not being created by the Congress; the agency was created by the President under Executive order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BLAND. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct as I understand it.

Mr. BLAND. The Congress is only providing the necessary appropriations. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BARDEN. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that a lot of this work is already being done. If the gentleman lived in the district where the work was being done he would understand just the situation that confronted them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not object to this, because the Alaska salmon fishing industry is now just about at its peak. They had the problem of shipping men and supplies up there, for instance, for doing the work, through the O. P. A. to get food for the fishermen; then they had to work through the Army and the Navy to get to Alaska, and all these agencies. It finally became so chaotic that some of the fishermen just threw up their hands and said they would not go. Then they created this coordinator. He in turn fixed all this up and coordinated the whole thing so that the whole fleet went to Alaska. Many of them are now on their way back and if this agency does not continue I am afraid the fishermen may get snagged up there in a lot of red tape with a lot of the agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is all these problems can be taken care of by existing agencies. This comes to us without any specific request of any kind. I have talked to Dr. Gabrielson about this matter. The point is you set up another agency and when this emergency is over the question is whether it will not continue like so many emergency agencies and be back for further appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There will be no necessity and, of course, Dr. Gabrielson is using men from his own Division who are experienced coordinators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This agency once established will continue and continue; it will follow tradition.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to read some of the benefits that have resulted thus far:

Coordination has worked in the last few months—

1. In food production.
2. In securing priorities involving material and equipment for repair, replacement, and expansion of (a) fishing gear, (b) fishing boats, and (c) shore processing plants.
3. In promoting fishing vessel construction and release of fishing vessels for fishing.
4. In effecting return of requisitioned fishing vessels as speedily as possible.
5. In helping to supply net and twine requirements for fishing industry.
6. In alleviating restrictions imposed on fishing areas for military purposes, such as bombing ranges, port restrictions, hours of fishing at sea, and radio restrictions on shipping vessels at sea.
7. In assisting OPA in fixing price control, in determining maximum prices for fishery products and in working out allocations to minimize dislocations occasioned by price control.
8. In establishing liaison with each of 23 Government agencies having authority for action seriously affecting fish production.

9. In working out expanded program for production and also improving methods of conservation. In helping to keep up morale and active efforts of fishermen to meet the difficult problems arising from war conditions.

The fishermen who came before my committee were ready to throw up their hands because of the difficulty of getting their problems solved and the contacts that are necessary to be made with these various agencies, something which is very evident to every Member of Congress when he undertakes to deal with any one of these agencies in a solution of the problems that come before him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. Is it not strange that no one has ever said anything to the subcommittee about this matter? And it takes an appropriation for its activities.

Mr. BLAND. This is an authorization, and the matter has to come before the gentleman's committee to say whether the money is granted or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But once an authorization has been approved by Congress the appropriation follows as a matter of course.

Mr. BLAND. Not always.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Almost inevitably.

Mr. BLAND. Not always, and I say that based on my experience of many years in this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Generally it does. To me it is rather strange that our committee has heard nothing from either Dr. Gabrielson or the departments.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say that the Navy has taken over a great number of boats. Also, in various areas off the coast they have planted mines, and they had to have a committee cooperating between this branch and the Navy Department to remove the mines from the fishing areas. Many priority questions have to be settled. I am sure the gentleman knows how difficult it is to get one department to go to another department to get something done. There are 23 bureaus that have to do with the fishing industry, and this industry being so important it was absolutely necessary to have some coordination between these departments or the fishermen would just throw up their hands. Half of them come filing into the Congressmen's offices. To be perfectly frank with you, this is a relief bill for the Members of Congress who represent these seacoast areas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot move to strike out the last word when the bill is not before the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], chairman of the committee that reported this bill, is not here, and also due to the fact I want some more information on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LAND TO MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 378, to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Secretary of the Interior is not in favor of this bill, nor has it been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget; therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF OYSTERS FROM WATERS OF YORK RIVER AND QUEEN CREEK, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2886, to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee how much it will cost to save these \$136,000 worth of oysters? This bill provides for saving \$136,000 worth of oysters.

Mr. BLAND. I noticed that and inquired about it. I understand a request will be made of the Bureau of the Budget for \$75,000. My information is that there will be practically no cost—I know how that is always taken with a smile, I do so myself—to the Government for the reason that the purpose of the plan is to buy these oysters and transfer them to the waters from which they may be sold.

The situation is that these oyster lands around York River and Queen Creek, are in an area that was free from pollution. In order to secure freedom from pollution the State of Virginia, the city of Williamsburg, and the localities around there expended about \$250,000 on a P. W. A. project, then the State of Virginia passed a law which absolutely prohibited any pollution within this area. Acting under those laws and under that procedure, these persons planted their oysters.

The oysters are now in good shape to be removed to other bottoms and after

purification for the necessary period will be sold. The Government, exercising its powers, acquired the upland properties for a CB battalion camp and they have there a CB battalion camp with no provision as to sewage from camp or hospital and no provision to take care of any of the sanitation whatever. There are now about 50,000 men in the plant and the evidence shows there will be about 80,000 there shortly.

The lands of the owners who planted these oysters were taken and they have no place to put their boats or to move the oysters. The plan of the Navy is to have an organization that will take care of this. There is one organization that can help take care of this. I refer to the Chesapeake Corporation. The plan of the Navy is to acquire these oysters, transfer them to unpolluted areas and sell them. They have now, so Commander Earle told me last night, considerable demand for the oysters and he says there will be practically no loss to the Government. Of course, I say that with a little bit of qualification.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This, I understand, is to save these oysters, is that correct?

Mr. BLAND. It is to save the oysters because they will be ready to be marketed soon. If they can be sent to the unpolluted areas they can then be sold and the supply of oysters, I may say, is extremely low.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell me from his long experience if there is any way to take care of grape growers in two of my counties who have 26,000 tons of grapes? The Department of Agriculture, through Mr. Card speaking for them, says those grapes will be wasted. They are worth \$100 a ton, a total of \$2,600,000. Is there any way I can hook that grape proposal onto your oyster bill.

Mr. BLAND. I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know while he is trying to save these \$200,000 for the folks down in the oyster beds how I can do something for these grape growers?

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could find out. If I could I would tell the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The substance of the answer now is that we can go whistle. The same thing is happening with reference to onions and celery running into millions of tons.

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could give the gentleman the answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can we not get a coordinator who can do something?

Mr. BLAND. I would like to be able to do it, but if the gentleman cannot do it, certainly I cannot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot do anything. I wish I could. If I had my way I would wipe them out down there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to investigate the extent of damage, actual or potential, to

oysters in the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., resulting from sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and to take such action as he may consider expedient to cause such oysters to be removed and transplanted into unpolluted waters of the vicinity, or otherwise to provide for their marketability for human consumption at the earliest lawful season.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

RENZIE GRAHAM

The Clerk called the first individual bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 550, for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the administrator of the estate of Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, for the use and benefit of the widow and children of said Renzie Graham the sum of \$6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government for the death of the said Renzie Graham resulting from injuries sustained by him during a period of hospitalization in the veterans' facility, Dayton, Ohio, due to the negligence of the staff of said hospital when the said Renzie Graham was burned by X-ray treatments given by the said staff; and for medical, hospital, traveling, and other expenses incurred and paid by the said Renzie Graham and by his said widow by reason of the illness and death and burial of the said Renzie Graham: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "to", strike out "the administrator of the estate of Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, for the use and benefit of the widow and children of said Renzie Graham" and insert in lieu thereof "Mrs. Renzie Graham, of Athens, Ohio, widow of Renzie Graham, deceased."

Page 2, line 1, after "of", strike out "\$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,900."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham."

MOSES TENNENBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2456, for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. MCGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 438, for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas, heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that she shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA M. KOHLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1434, for the relief of Anna M. Kohler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, an immigration visa shall not be refused and an exclusion at a port of entry shall not be required in the case of Anna M. Kohler under the moral turpitude clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, insofar as the offense which she admitted committing in Canada may be concerned.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL SZELIGA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2134, for the relief of Paul Szeliga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation heretofore issued against Paul Szeliga. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 1, 1923.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. FEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2184, to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey

to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. SPRINGER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 135, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, said claim arising out of certain grants and commitments, agreements, and contracts to and with the United States of America, by and through the Public Works Administration and other agencies and administrations. Suit hereunder may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, and proceedings therein, appeals therefrom, and payment of judgment thereon, if any, shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court had jurisdiction under the provisions of the Judicial Code.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD GILLAM

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 254, for the relief of Edward Gillam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

PREMIER INSURANCE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1317, for the relief of Premier Insurance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Premier Insurance Co., the sum of \$421.50. Such sum is for reimbursement of the amount paid by said company to George Henry Bartole, San Diego, Calif., as insurance for property damage sustained on May 3, 1942, when his automobile was struck on United States Highway No. 101, near San Clemente, Calif., by a United States Corps jeep.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "Company," insert "of 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif."

In line 7, after "\$421.50" strike out the period and "Such sum is" and insert a comma and the following: "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services

rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN WOODWARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2718) for the relief of Lillian Woodward.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

KATHLEEN B. MAIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$72, to Kathleen B. Maier, of Passaic, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered as a temporary clerk in the office of Local Board No. 8, Passaic County, N. J., Selective Service System, in September 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE STAMPS AND HENRIETTA E. STAMPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2824) for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alice Stamps, \$288.10; to Henrietta E. Stamps, \$1,136.35; said sums being in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, property damage, or medical expenses resulting from a collision on November 4, 1939, when the claimant's automobile was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in the city of North Tonawanda, N. Y.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "Alice Stamps," insert the language: "of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the sum of."

Page 1, line 6, after the words "Henrietta E. Stamps," strike out the language "\$1,136.35; said sums being" and insert in lieu thereof the language "of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the sum of \$886.35."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "claimant's" and after the word "automobile" insert the words "of Alice Stamps."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY & CASUALTY CO. AND BAUGH CHEMICAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3016) for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE F. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1869) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson, of the United States Marine Corps, for conspicuous bravery while serving as a private in the Marine Corps on the morning of July 18, 1918, at the forest of Retz.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VELMA PIKKARAINEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 332) for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$825, to Velma Pikkarainen, of Townier County, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the value of a Ford automobile seized by agents of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, on June 22, 1939, and sold on November 10, 1939, the basis for such seizure and sale being that such automobile allegedly had been used by O. V. Pikkarainen, the husband of the said Velma Pikkarainen, to facilitate a violation of the customs laws, although the criminal case against the said O. V. Pikkarainen was dismissed: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 346) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RICHARD P. BEALE AND EVA M. BEALE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Richard Dodge Beale, son of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving on United States Highway No. 99, Ridge Route, Kern County, State of California, was struck by a United States Army 2½-ton truck, Chevrolet No. W328099: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney, on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to," strike out the language "Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the language "the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased, the sum of \$5,542.87."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the language "son of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "two-and-one-half-ton."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L.T. COMDR. WALTER H. SCHWARTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 273, for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz, Medical Corps, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz, Medical Corps of the United States Navy, the sum of \$. . . The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz against the United States on account of damage to his household effects while such effects were en route from Honolulu, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif. The said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz was serving in line of duty. On or about December 27, 1941, the household effects of the said Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz were shipped from Honolulu on a vessel chartered by the

Navy Department under contract N-220s-65213, and arrived in the United States in a badly damaged condition: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,592.27 to the persons whose names appear below, as compensation in full for damages to their private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif., on or about December 27, 1941, on a vessel chartered by the Navy Department for the purpose of evacuating the families of naval personnel from Hawaii: Wilma L. Aeschliman, \$167.15; Commander Lysle W. Cease, United States Navy, \$178.67; Carpenter Robert A. Dusch, United States Navy, \$175.83; Grace Lee Gench, wife of E. L. Gench, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy (deceased), \$867.73; Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles A. Giermann, United States Navy, \$321.50; Donald E. Harvey, aviation metal-smith, first class, United States Navy, \$26.50; Machinist E. F. Kyne, United States Navy, \$198; Mrs. O. A. Martin, wife of O. A. Martin, torpedoman, first class, United States Navy, \$655.63; H. L. Pott, chief water tender, United States Navy, \$66; Mrs. V. E. Pruess, wife of V. E. Pruess, radioman, first class, United States Navy, \$700.92; Mrs. W. H. Schwartz, wife of Lt. Comdr. W. H. Schwartz, United States Navy, \$1,599.38; L. P. Smith, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy, \$190; Lt. Comdr. A. M. Townsend, United States Navy, \$400.69; Commander J. P. Wood, United States Navy, \$886.85; Anna T. Guthrie, wife of F. Guthrie, chief boatswain, United States Navy, \$473.67; Reuben J. Kemper, carpenter's mate, first class, United States Navy, \$161; Jim Caudel, radioman, first class, United States Navy, \$333.42; Carpenter H. L. Powers, United States Navy, \$189.33: *Provided*, That if any of the beneficiaries under this act are deceased, payment herein authorized shall be made to their heirs: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif."

ROBERT A. HUDSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 383, for the relief of Robert H. Hudson. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

SIGURD J. E. WALLSTEDT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 400, for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt, a resident of the Territory of Alaska, the sum of \$18,911.35, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained on July 17, 1941, at Seward, Alaska, while a passenger in a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$18,911.35" and insert "\$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROBERT C. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 938, for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Robert C. Anderson, Denham, Minn., the sum of \$58.38. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson against the United States on account of necessary expenses incurred by her in connection with a journey from Minneapolis, Minn., to Memphis, Tenn., and return, such journey having been undertaken as the result of the receipt of a telegram from the Department of the Navy stating that her husband, a fireman, second-class, in the United States Navy and stationed at the United States Naval Training School at Memphis, was seriously ill. Upon her arrival in Memphis, the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson learned that her husband was not ill and that the telegram had been sent to her by mistake.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figure "\$58.38" strike out period, insert comma, then strike out words "Such sum shall be."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "of the said Mrs. Robert C. Anderson."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "ill" strike out period and the word "Upon" and insert comma and words "when upon."

At the end of bill strike out period and add: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per-

cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH PASTE ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1665, for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$400 to Joseph Paste; the sum of \$1,000 to Anna Paste; the sum of \$300 to Rose Paste; the sum of \$1,000 to the legal guardian of Doris Paste; the sum of \$300 to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages as a result of a collision between the car on which they were riding and a United States Army truck, on State Highway No. 3, in Plymouth, Mass., on November 16, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INA MAE SHIPMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1769, for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman, of Osceola, St. Clair County, Mo., the sum of \$18,766.40, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Bernal Shipman, and property damage, personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by her as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 54, near Collins, Mo., on November 30, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, at the end of the line, strike out "\$18,766.40" and insert "\$11,039."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "property damage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD E. DALTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1887, for the relief of Harold E. Dalton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold E. Dalton, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$18,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Harold E. Dalton on October 20, 1938, when the automobile which he was driving at or near Rialto, Calif., was struck by a United States Forestry fire truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$5,382.09."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "truck", insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL W. BUCEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1915, for the relief of Carl W. Bucey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl W. Bucey, Canton, Ohio, the sum of \$313.16, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States Government for damages done his Plymouth sedan by an Army truck at the intersection of State Route No. 31 with Chaffee Avenue, Fort Knox, Ky., on February 5, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$313.16" and insert "\$330.35."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD A. SILVIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1918, for the relief of Edward A. Silvia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of \$7,500 to Edward A. Silvia, of Quincy, Mass., for medical and hospital expenses and for personal injuries received as the result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle on June 26, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARCUS O. AND FAYE D. ROWLAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1920, for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marcus O. Rowland and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased, of Locust Grove, Mayes County, First District, Okla., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by said Marcus O. Rowland and Faye D. Rowland on account of the death of George L. Rowland, deceased, who died from injuries received October 20, 1938, in the accident when the automobile in which he was driving at or near Rialto, Calif., was struck by a United States Forestry fire truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$4,000."

Page 2, line 2, strike out word "driving" and insert in lieu thereof the word "riding."

At end of bill strike out period and add: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per-

cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1962, for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. SPRINGER and MCGREGOR objected and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FRANK AND NANCY FOGLIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2244, for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased, the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Frank Foglia and for all expense incidental thereto. The death of the said Frank Foglia was the direct result of injuries sustained by Frank Foglia while he was a passenger in a truck which was the property of the United States and which was operated by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, beginning with the word "Frank" after the word "to", strike out all of the bill through and including the word "Corps" on line 3, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the language "Frank Foglia and Nancy Foglia, of Fairview, N. J., parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased, the sum of \$5,983.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Frank Foglia, a minor, and expenses incident thereto, resulting from personal injuries sustained while he was riding in a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Preakness, N. J., on August 19, 1941."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2915, for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Pacific Construction Co., Ltd., for loss sustained by expropriation of lumber and building materials at Haleiwa, Oahu, T. H., by the United States Army on and after December 7, 1941, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim not to exceed \$2,604.55. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$2,604.55, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES PARCEL POST BUILDING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 159, for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United States Parcel Post Building Co. the sum of \$4,827.06, in full settlement of its claim against the United States for rent alleged to be due for the period from July 1 to July 23, 1935, for quarters in the Parcel Post Station Building, Cleveland, Ohio, formerly occupied by the Post Office Department as a parcel-post station under lease dated October 9, 1928: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEORGE E. GOLDING

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 426, for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George E. Golding, major, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was relieved from active duty because of physical disability on August 2, 1941, and who was returned to active duty for the

period from November 12, 1941, to April 1, 1942, for appearances before a board of medical survey and a Navy retiring board, the sum of \$2,161.31, representing pay and allowances for such period of active duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIMO GIORDANENGO AND ANGIE GIORDANENGO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 462, for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of \$1,471.31, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damages to, and for loss of rentals from, their apartment building in San Pedro, Calif., which resulted from heavy gunfire on May 16, 1942, by Coast Artillery units located at Fort MacArthur, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINE ARBUCKLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 626, for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angeline Arbuckle, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 53, in St. Louis County, Minn., on July 23, 1937: *Provided*, That the acceptance of such sum shall be in full and final settlement of any and all judgments against Walter Mitchell, driver of the Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. LASSITER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 652, for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Lassiter, of Rockingham, N. C., the sum of \$1,541, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for reimbursement of hospital and medical expenses incurred as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Rockingham, N. C., on November 22, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL JACOBS AND HARRY JACOBS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 787, for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$1,743.18 and to Harry Jacobs, his son, the sum of \$900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, at the intersection of North Avenue and Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, Md., on December 6, 1941, at 12:05 a. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. W. GOIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 824, for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. J. W. Goin, of Albany, Oreg., the sum of \$3,005, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for loss of and damage to certain livestock as the result of eating borax which had been placed by employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, as a weed deterrent, around transmission-line poles on property owned by the said Dr. J. W. Goin on or about June 24, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. SHIRLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 852, for the relief of John T. Shirley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CLARE A. MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 977, for the relief of Clare A. Miller.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clare A. Miller, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which she was a passenger was struck by a United States Army automobile on July 17, 1941, on United States Highway No. 1, south of South Hill, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,437.05."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "sustain", insert "and hospital, medical, and other expenses resulting."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN ENGELL THOMPSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1666, for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helen Engell Thompson, Olympia, Wash., the sum of \$2,029.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Helen Engell Thompson against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property on April 4, 1942, when a United States Army aircraft crashed into and destroyed her residence in the city of Olympia, Wash.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$2,029.50", strike out period and insert comma, then strike out the words "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Helen Engell Thompson" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full settlement of all claims"

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT FERGUSON AND OZELLE FERGUSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1973, for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson, Joe Wheeler Dam, Ala., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their minor child, Doris Ann Ferguson, on June 22, 1942, caused by being run over by a truck in the service of and operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH-CABLE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2340, for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$1,506.81, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring an aerial cable line at the foot of Seventh Street in Oakland, Calif., which was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy TBF-1 airplane, Bur. No. 00495, on December 2, 1942, while engaged in making a flight over Oakland, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,506.81 in full satisfaction of its claim" and insert "\$1,501.48 in full settlement of all claims."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN C. FERREIRA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1435, for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian C. Ferreira the sum of \$3,000, in full settlement for injuries sustained by her late husband, John S. Ferreira, of Fall River, Mass., when he was knocked down and badly injured by a United States post-office vehicle on October 16, 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Ferreira," insert the words "of Fall River, Mass."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figure "\$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,500."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "settlement" insert the words "of all claims against the United States."

Page 1, line 9, after "1939" add the words "at Fall River, Mass."

At the end of bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT KISH LEE AND ELIZABETH KISH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 915, for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Robert Kish Lee, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States mail truck driven by Vincent Amatrudi, an employee of the Post Office Department, in the performance of his official duties, in New York City, on July 31, 1939; the said Robert Kish Lee having obtained a judgment for \$500 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such injuries, and (2) to Elizabeth Kish, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$112.72, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and other expenses incurred by her on account of the injuries so sustained by the said Robert Kish Lee; the said Elizabeth Kish having obtained a judgment for \$112.72 against the said Vincent Amatrudi, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on account of such expenses: *Provided*, That the said Robert Kish Lee and the said Elizabeth Kish shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Vincent Amatrudi from liability for the payment of such judgments: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. DOUGLAS E. LAWSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 929, for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of compensation to officers and employees of the Work Projects Administration, to Dr. Douglas E. Lawson, of Carbondale, Ill., the sum of \$134.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of the unpaid portion of the compensation agreed upon for the services rendered by him during the Wyoming Adult Education, Recreation, and Nursery School Workers Training Conference, held at the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., from August 18 to 30, 1941, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in

excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS LEFF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 244, for the relief of Morris Leff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Morris Leff, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and injuries sustained by Morris Leff in an accident involving an Army airplane near Farmingdale, Long Island, on December 7, 1941; said injury being incurred when Morris Leff and other bystanders were struck by said plane which made a forced landing: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out "\$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "for", strike out the words "damages and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "personal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. CRAIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 310, for the relief of Robert M. Crain.

Messrs. MCGREGOR and MADDEN objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LUTHER C. NANNY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 937, for the relief of Luther C. Nanny.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther C. Nanny, of Corpus Christi, Tex., the sum of \$872.35, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of a housecar-trailer destroyed on June 12, 1942, in Nueces County, Tex., by fire caused from the crash of a training plane from the Corpus Christi Naval Air Training Station.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Luther C." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Mittie Pearl."

At the end of the bill strike out the period and add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny."

ESTATE OF HYMAN WIENER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1049, for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Hyman Wiener, the sum of \$25,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for fatal injuries sustained by him by an airplane owned and operated by the United States Army, which plane fell on him on the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or directed to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the language "\$7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Hyman Wiener, who was fatally injured when a United States Army plane fell on him at Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1555, for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arkansas Power & Light Co., Little Rock, Ark., the sum of \$3,574.81. Such sum represents the value, agreed upon by the company and representatives of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, of facilities and equipment for the distribution of electric power which were installed by the company at former Camp Pike (now Camp Robinson), Little Rock, Ark., when such camp was a National Guard camp, under an agreement that such facilities and equipment were to remain the property of the company, and which were taken over and requisitioned by the United States on November 28, 1940.

With the following Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$3,574.81" strike out period and insert comma, then strike out words "Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof the words "In full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

At end of bill strike out period and add, "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. HAAS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2182, for the relief of John E. Haas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law John E. Haas, an employee of the Treasury Department retired under the provisions of section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 305; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 736 (a)), shall not be required to reimburse the United States for any annuity payments received by him during the period of his employment at Hine Junior High School as the director of a boys' club, under the Community Center Department of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, from July 1, 1935, to April 1, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "District" add the words "of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REESE FLIGHT INSTRUCTION, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2507, for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reese Flight Instruction, Inc., a California corporation, the sum of \$2,975.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to aircraft and damage to and destruction of other property owned by such corporation when on January 17, 1942, a Civil Aeronautics Administration airplane, attempting to take off from the Metropolitan Airport, Van Nuys, Calif., struck the hangar in which aircraft and other property of such corporation were situated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of," strike out the language "\$2,975.50. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,675.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NELLIE STARR McCORKLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2675, providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a).

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Nellie Starr McCorkle, Mesilla Park, N. Mex., the sum of \$623.70, accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a), by reason of his civil employment prior to his being ordered to active duty, and payment of which was withheld by reason of the fact that he was killed in the Philippine Islands shortly after the passage of the act and before he was advised of the benefits accruing to him through the provisions of said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the figures "\$623.70," insert the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

At the end of bill strike out period and add "": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this

claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED A. UTLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 312, for the relief of Fred A. Utley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General shall not consider as applicable to Freda Utley the provisions of the Act of October 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 1012), as amended by the acts of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1008), and June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 670, 76th Cong., ch. 439).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY ANGELL OR HAJM ENGEL ALIAS HENRYK ENGEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2131, for the relief of Henry Angell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest in the case of the alien Henry Angell or Hajm Engel alias Henryk Engel, and is also directed not to issue any further such warrant in the case of this alien insofar as such warrant may be based on the unlawful entry of the alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said alien shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence at the port of New York on October 15, 1913.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE ENGERT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2509, for the relief of Marie Engert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Marie Engert as of July 6, 1939, the date on which she entered the United States, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of the appropriate nation when such quota number becomes available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM LEO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2902, for the relief of Mrs. William Leo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. William Leo, the Canadian native-born wife of an American citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. CRAIN

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 244, the bill (H. R. 310) for the relief of Robert M. Crain, introduced by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]. Being one of the objectors, I request that we reconsider the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert M. Crain, Surry, N. H., the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Crain, against the United States on account of damage to personal property and the loss by drowning of three horses on the night of March 9-10, 1942, caused by the sudden inundation of the land on which such property was located and such horses were accustomed to pasture, when the Surry Mountain Dam, owned and operated by the United States, was closed without any previous notice to the said Robert M. Crain.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$500", strike out the period and the following: "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Crain," and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business

in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to.

On tomorrow the Committee on Appropriations will report out a joint resolution appropriating \$18,000,000-plus for infant and maternity care of the wives of the men in the armed forces. I understand there is a unanimous report on this resolution and that it is not controversial. However, there will probably be some discussion of it while it is pending on the floor.

After tomorrow there is nothing for the rest of the week. It is my intention that the House adjourn from Wednesday to Thursday and then from Thursday until Monday.

As far as next week is concerned, I can see nothing at the present time. If anything of a controversial nature should develop next week which requires the consideration of the House I shall confer with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and see that the Members of the House have ample advance notice, so that they can make their plans accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HANDBOOK FOR SERVICEMEN AND SERVICEWOMEN, WORLD WAR NO. 2, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (Rept. No. 706) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 300) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War No. 2, and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War No. 2, and Their Dependents," be printed as a public document, and that 8,000 additional copies be printed for the document room of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

STEEL SHORTAGE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Office of Economic Stabilization, of which Hon. James M. Byrnes is Director, is making a survey to investigate allegations that a surplus of labor exists in Pacific coast shipbuilding plants.

Whatever surplus of labor does exist in Pacific coast shipyards is due to the shortage of steel which is allocated to the yards on a quarterly basis. During the congressional recess I visited every major shipbuilding plant in California, all of which are located on San Francisco Bay, at Los Angeles, or San Diego. A shortage of steel existed at every one of these shipyards. Due entirely to this shortage of steel, the largest single shipyard on the Pacific coast, which employs over 42,000 workers, is being forced to curtail production during the present quarter to the extent of a ship and a half per month. This yard, like all other shipbuilding plants, endeavors to maintain its organization intact, anticipating an adequate allocation of steel. It is a tragic situation that there is such a shortage of steel that it must be allocated, thus creating uncertainty from one quarter to another as to how much steel will be available for ship construction.

The blame for what appears to be a surplus number of employees should not be placed upon those shipyards, but rather upon the steel masters of this country who have tried to lead the Nation to believe that they were furnishing all the steel required to carry on our war activities, including not alone the building of ships and munitions of war, but also farm machinery, normal civilian requirements for the construction of homes to house war workers, and every other use of steel. Steel is one of the most important commodities in our present-day economy, entering into an untold number of every-day uses.

This shortage of steel production by the steel masters is so great at the present time that the War Production Board has been forced to reduce the allocation of steel to the War Department to a point 14 percent below its requirements during the present quarter. The Navy Department has been cut 20 percent during this same period, while the Maritime Commission is being forced to reduce its shipbuilding because 22 percent of its requirements of steel cannot be met. At the same time, with the increased strain being placed upon our railroad facilities, the Office of Defense Transportation requirements of steel have been cut 40 percent.

The over-all shortage of steel for necessary war purposes during the 3 months of July, August, and September 1943, amounts to 6,250,000 tons, which, on an annual basis, would amount to 25,000,000 tons.

In this connection I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for increased steel production to furnish the farmers of this Nation with the necessary farm machinery to maintain and increase production. Every Member of Congress representing a rural district knows of this serious

shortage and one of the most constructive efforts they can put forth is to aid in increasing our steel production.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that this steel shortage has had one single cause—the centralization of the steel industry in the grip of a few steel magnates within a small geographical area here in the eastern part of the United States. Those people who are now crying the loudest have utterly failed to lend a hand to a solution of this problem. Only the decentralization of the steel industry in this country will enable us to produce enough steel for our wartime and our peacetime needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Corfee). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dickstein] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ADMISSION OF REFUGEES FROM EUROPE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a copy of House Joint Resolution 154 and such excerpts as I deem necessary in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that more of us are not present at this time, but this has been a rather trying day. I want to address the House on House Joint Resolution 154 which I introduced a few days ago. The resolution speaks for itself. It does not deal with appropriations, but it deals with human elements and relief of human suffering. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Eaton] today in speaking on the Fulbright resolution—an address which I admired very much as did others—said that we are all God's children, and that we live under the same roof, and that no one should take advantage of the light. Yes; we are all God's children, and that imposes certain duties upon us toward our fellow men who are also God's children. Can we honestly say that we have lived up to our duties and obligations toward the men, women, and children who have been and still are being tortured and murdered by the Nazi sadists?

In the changing panorama of events as they unfold before us from day to day one fact stands out more vividly than any other, the fact that the Nazi government has embarked on a policy of ruthless extermination of the European races. The foremost sufferers from this policy are the Jews, but they are not by any means the only ones to experience the full measure of Hitler's wrath.

It was because of this great urgency to rescue from the clutches of a ruthless dictator the innocent people, particularly children, and offer them some sort of haven, that my resolution, House Joint Resolution 154, was introduced.

What I propose to do under this resolution is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our present immigration laws.

A few months ago a conference was held in Bermuda to take up the refugee problem. Nothing was accomplished,

however, and the conference was a great disappointment.

Nevertheless it is so much water over the dam, and it would be useless to try to point out, at this time, just why and to what extent the conference did not accomplish what it set itself out to do.

The important question is not what could have been done, but what can be done. And I believe that my resolution points to a very definite immediate program and gives us the opportunity of paying at least some of the debt, which as a great humanitarian nation we owe to those who cannot otherwise help themselves.

It has always been the boast of the United States that we furnished the asylum for the oppressed, and a sanctuary for those who were seeking to escape persecution.

About 100 years ago, in the famed year of 1848, when all of Europe was convulsed by revolutions, which sought to establish constitutional governments in those countries which stuck to the principles of absolute monarchy, it was our country which offered asylum to men like Kossuth, Garibaldi, and other great leaders of liberal thought. Later on when Europe was again convulsed by anarchy and when massacres were the order of the day in such countries as Russia and Rumania, we again opened our doors to refugees from that terror and permitted many persons to escape persecution and find homes in America.

Again in 1917, when our immigration law was amended so as to impose a literacy test on prospective immigrants to these shores, we saw fit to put in a provision in the law to the effect that people escaping religious persecution should not be subject to the literacy test, thereby again proclaiming to the world our determination to act as an asylum for persons who escaped from religious persecution.

In 1917 religious persecution was confined to Jews and Armenians. This time, religious persecution covers a more extensive area in that not only Jews but Catholics, not only Catholics but Protestants are persecuted. In general religious persecution today has developed into other types of persecution. Racial persecution is as potent a weapon in the hands of the Axis Nations as it was in the days of Czarist Russia or when a benighted Turkey saw fit to persecute Armenians and others for their beliefs.

The type of persecution which Hitler indulges in is much more cruel because it dooms to destruction many races for no other reason than that of being members of a group which Hitler believes has no right to live.

Hitler's policies were assiduously copied by his admirers and satellites, in fact, whenever Hitler succeeded in attacking or appropriating a country, he brought along with him his own ideas of racial persecution and all the countries of Central Europe, and the countries of western and northern Europe which were overrun by Hitler's military might, have added their own brand of religious and racial persecution.

There is, however, one difference between the type of persecution which Hitler indulges in and the type which his satellites have aped. Hitler knows no mercy. He has exterminated or is about to exterminate every non-German within his borders, except such people as he can use in performing slave labor for the Reich.

Hitler's satellites have not gone quite so far. They have denied human and political rights to their minorities, they have trampled under foot any pledge they had made in the peace treaties to treat their minorities fairly, but they have not quite seen fit to exterminate their minorities by massacres and killings. There is, therefore, this ray of hope left. We may still rescue individuals who have fallen under the tyranny of Hitler's satellites, but who have been able to escape with their lives. In fact, some of these subject countries are willing to enter into a kind of bargain with their minorities. They will let them go, provided somebody else will undertake to receive them and assume the responsibility of their removal.

This gives us the opportunity to show the fine and exalted spirit of America which has always risen to the sublime philanthropy of humanitarianism when the opportunity presented itself to rescue human beings from death.

I believe that the bill introduced by me will go a long way toward this purpose, even though we cannot possibly hope and we cannot possibly expect to save every one of the many innocent people who will be murdered if Hitler and his cohorts have their way.

We do not expect the United States to stand alone in this matter. I am sure other nations which value human rights and which have respect for human lives will join us in our program of rescue. I am sure Great Britain will do its share to help and I know that many neutral nations will likewise facilitate the rescue and survival of many, if we but point the way.

I cannot refrain, at this time, from mentioning the fact that Switzerland has already done a great deal to help the unfortunate refugees whenever it was possible for that little country to help.

I do not wish to take the time of this House in painting a gruesome picture of conditions which we are called upon to alleviate, but it will help to understand the problem if some typical instances were given of the ruthlessness and brutality which the Nazi regime has been guilty of in the treatment of its minorities, particularly in the treatment of the Jewish people.

I shall give you some eyewitness accounts which will show you how important it is for us to act if we do not wish the rest of Nazi-dominated countries—I mean the Axis satellites—to pursue the same methods and act in the same manner to cause havoc and destruction among its helpless minorities.

The place in which the most horrible destruction of human lives occurred was the old Polish capital of Warsaw. In 1939 this city withstood a siege by the Germans which lasted some 3 weeks

and only after the most thorough destruction of all of the city's streets and buildings did the Polish people surrender to the fury of the German invaders. Thereafter, Warsaw was made into a central concentration camp for the Jews from all parts of Poland.

A ghetto was established in the city, separated from the rest of the country by an 8-foot wall. Into this ghetto were crowded all the Jewish refugees from every portion of Poland and later all the Jews from Germany and other western countries were likewise shipped into this ghetto. Eventually the population of this small area was increased to a tremendous figure and almost a million people were compelled to live in the territory which was originally designed for less than 100,000. No wonder the ghetto in Warsaw became a very unsanitary and pestiferous place.

But the Germans had no intention of leaving a large aggregation of people in any particular area. The object of crowding them together was merely to be able to liquidate them sooner. By July 1942 the population of the Warsaw ghetto had dwindled down through starvation and disease to about 400,000. It was at this point that the head of the German Gestapo, Himmler, took charge. He called together a Nazi meeting at which he declared that Hitler had personally told him that the Jews should be punished, since it was only through their influence that England and France had come to the rescue of Poland. If the Jews had not induced the Western Powers to declare war on Germany, there would have been no problem in the East and Germany would have been supreme. Hitler and his henchman, Himmler, did not want the Jews to die without suffering agony and the worst possible tortures. Himmler, therefore, paid a personal visit to Warsaw, and supervised the massacres there. From October 1942 to January 1943, more than 300,000 Jews were put to death in the most horrible manner that could be devised by the minds of madmen. By February there were only 35,000 Jews left in Warsaw. Many of those who were murdered were lying about in the streets covered with newspapers, relatives frequently carried their dead outside the ghetto, and in the gutters and on the sidewalks one could see unconscious Jews left there to die. Throughout the ghetto no food was available. The Jews had to look through the refuse lying about on the streets to find any food at all, and very often even the refuse did not yield anything.

Thereafter the German authorities declared that the remnant of the Warsaw Jews should be deported from Warsaw and the ghetto closed. It was then that an order was issued directing all Jews to leave Warsaw for the East for hard labor. The aged, the sick, and those incapable of hard labor were killed before the order became effective. The Germans declared cynically that by this measure they were insuring larger food supplies for those who would remain. Five thousand persons were deported daily. Later the number was increased, and eventually, of course, all of the in-

habitants of the Warsaw ghetto and other Polish ghettos were marked for destruction.

But, fortunately, there are still many who can be saved.

We, as a democracy, cannot allow the world to sit idly by and see the destruction of the untold victims of Nazi wrath. It is the boast of Hitler and his henchmen that before we shall rescue those who can be rescued, the remaining victims will be destroyed and annihilated.

It is evident that any help that is to be given should be given without delay.

In the resolution which was introduced by me, House Joint Resolution 154, I call attention to the fact that ocean transportation can be made available on returning transports, and I, therefore, feel that we should grant immediate relief to those who can be rescued from the Nazi terror. The text of my resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution to provide for the temporary admission into the United States of political or religious refugees from the Axis Nations

Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial and religious denominations, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis Nations; and

Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done within the next few months, which months will embrace winter, countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants, there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

Whereas under present practices of administrative officials but very few persons are permitted to come to the United States temporarily or otherwise; and

Whereas ocean transportation of persons coming to the United States can be made available on returning transports: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., that it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that immediate temporary relief should be granted to those unfortunate people and it is therefore urged that an administrative policy be adopted to admit to the United States for a period not exceeding 6 months after hostilities have ceased between the Allied and Axis Nations such persons now residing in continental Europe who desire to come to the United States and who can establish to the satisfaction of any American consul before whom they may appear that they are bona fide political or religious refugees: Provided, however, That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this joint resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathsome, dangerous, or contagious diseases, have criminal records of crimes involving moral turpitude, or whose presence in the United States would endanger the public safety of the United States or otherwise be inimical to the best interests of the United States. It is further urged as being within the spirit of this joint resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of the joint resolution, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are urged to issue their joint regulations to carry into effect the purpose of this joint resolution just as

soon as it is possible following the passage of the joint resolution.

Along with many neutral countries, we are called upon to do our share in alleviating the conditions I described. I am aware of the fact that whatever can be done will by no means solve or settle the entire problem, but it will be the best that can be done under the circumstances.

Recent historical events have more poignantly shown the extreme ruthlessness of the Nazi philosophy of life and the Nazi point of view.

As you know the Italian people saw fit to surrender to our armed forces and eventually to resume their proper station in the family of nations. But such a solution of affairs does not comport with the philosophy of the Nazi "masters." When they saw themselves balked in their policy which subjugated all the nations of the world and when one of their satellites eventually adopted enough courage to throw off the yoke of their "friendship," immediately the German military might set itself to loot and destroy everything that could not be carried away, and everything that could be carried away was taken. Not an item of food was left for the starving people, and whenever the Germans were able to cart things away, they did so.

Churches have been pillaged and robbed of their treasures and the holy places were converted into means for the carrying on of warfare—even the sacred precincts of the Vatican were invaded by a ruthless army bent upon destruction. Hitler proclaimed himself the protector of Vatican City, just as he had become the "protector" of Luxemburg, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, and all the other European countries which he ruthlessly invaded. If nothing else this sacrilegious action on the part of the German Wehrmacht showed the character of the foe whom we are fighting and if his depredations are allowed to go unchecked, Europe will become a barren waste, and its population slaughtered to the last man.

What have we done to help the people who might be rescued from the hell of Nazi persecution? Our doors have remained closed. The State Department has not moved. The Congress has not spoken. But the American people are beginning to realize their duty and are calling upon the Congress of the United States to do something to save as many human beings as possible. They know that it could be done if this Congress would only say so, and give the green light to the State Department. I do not want to dwell upon how it should be done. Mr. Speaker, I am not seeking to open the doors to refugees to a point where they will take jobs away from Americans. I am not seeking to bring in these refugees for permanent stay. I speak for the millions of people of America who have sent me petitions asking that men, women, and children who can be saved from the Axis may be saved by letting them come to these shores for temporary haven only, and that we allow them to stay here until the war in Europe is over. Is there any Member of

Congress who can deny that request? Is there any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate who can honestly say to himself and to his conscience and to his God that allowing a number of these unfortunate people to come here for temporary stay only would bring any harm to our country?

There are many fine American citizens who are willing to provide the food and care for them and all necessary expenses to be incurred. Give them some place, I do not care where, so that they may stay in peace until after the war is over, then they can be returned to their homes and farms. I have sent a letter to each Member of Congress, and I am looking forward to getting an answer from each Member of Congress. I have sent 48 letters to 48 Governors of our country, calling upon them to state their views on this question. I hope and pray that Congress will pass my resolution. If we do not, we certainly cannot say that we have upheld the moral and religious values we all have proclaimed at one time or another.

Bear in mind I am not only appealing for the Jews of Europe who are doomed to die but I am also appealing for the Christians who are also doomed to die at the hands of Hitler. I am appealing for all human beings who can find a haven in this country, without harming us in any way. Let us not wait until it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to go into a lot of details, but will just recite a little incident that happened in Poland. Fifty Nazi storm troopers were killed by some underground action. No one knew who killed them. It is too bad there were not 2,000,000 of them; but the decree came from the Gestapo, with the approval of the madman Hitler, that for every storm trooper who was killed, 200 Jews should be killed on the open market. So they took 200 to 1. Included in that group were many Christians, because they did not take the time to find out their religion.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as representatives of the American people to give such help to men and women who believe in our ideals, who are always in the forefront of the fight for the preservation of democracy and democratic principles. If this is a war to make the world safe for democracy, it must also be a war to preserve as many human lives as possible, who will be fighters for our democracy in years to come.

As far as the Jews are concerned, all I can say to this House and to the American people is this: I can only refer to the words of General MacArthur, who emphasized the fighting qualities of the people of the Jewish race, so many of whom have already given their lives to our cause. I also wish to repeat the words of Admiral Halsey who said, "The Jewish heritage has been one of suffering and sorrow. Jews have always fought against oppression, seeking freedom for themselves and for all the peoples of the world. Today the whole civilized world fights against history's greatest tyrants and oppressors. We are proud to have the Jews in our ranks. Their fights fur-

nish unshakable proof of their courage and loyalty to our common cause, the world-wide preservation of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity, in all fairness to our traditions, we Americans, who have always upheld the doctrine of helping the oppressed, should now at this time help those people.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNE. Can the gentleman tell us what our Government has done or attempted to do relative to this matter since we have been embroiled in this war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As far as I know, they have done nothing. There has been a lot of pussyfooting. The State Department is waiting for some expression by the Congress. The quotas have not been filled for the last 5 years or more. Last year's quota used was so little that it is insignificant. Some people can be saved—and they must be saved.

Mr. BYRNE. Then, as a matter of fact, as far as you know, and you have been in close contact with this problem ever since it started, our country has, as far as you know today, never done a single thing to attempt to save those people, either by giving them refuge here or bringing about a method by which they could find refuge. Is that correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is absolutely correct. There was the Bermuda Conference, which was called for the purpose of aiding refugees, but nothing came of it. Nothing has been done; nothing has been accomplished.

My dear colleagues, I just want to say this, and I am not going to keep you any longer; there is a lot more to say on this subject, but I do not want to take up too much time. Let us truly act as God's children would and should act toward their brethren. Let us, as human beings, take the leadership on this vital matter, and we are the leaders of civilization, as one of the largest Nations of the world. We have so much of its resources. We are the last hope that these unfortunate people have. We are the ones who can save them and see to it that their children may still live and be permitted to carry on the democratic principles for which we are fighting and for which they have fought and suffered so much.

What valid objections could anyone raise to permitting a number of these refugees to enter, not for permanent residence, not under the quota, but simply for the purpose of saving their lives—for the duration of the war in Europe? If we do not help them now, I am sure, from the information that I have received, and I am sure the State Department also has this information, that these people, perhaps a million or two of them, will be dead before Christmas comes around. Hitler knows he is finished; Hitler knows he is through. He cannot win, and as he is retreating—it is just like a harvest of hay—he cuts them here and there, no longer asking questions concerning religion or race.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the expression of the Members of the House by a

letter that I have written to them. I have called a hearing of the committee to be held by the first week in October. I know that this resolution has the approval of the churches of this country; I know that this resolution has the approval of all the religious denominations; it has the approval of the Democratic and Republican clubs. It is non-political; it is nonpartisan; it is a human question. Are we ready to act as human beings?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

736. A letter from the Director, National Resources Planning Board, transmitting a copy of the estimates of personnel requirements for the second quarter of the fiscal year for the National Resources Planning Board on Form No. 80-R001.1 provided by the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

737. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a revised copy of Bureau of the Budget Form No. 80-R001; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 300. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the manuscript entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen, World War II, and Their Dependents" as a public document; without amendment (Rept. No. 706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANGELL: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 3145. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and dikes for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming; with amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:
H. R. 3288. A bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to increase the allowance to dependent wives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:
H. R. 3289. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:
H. R. 3290. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3291. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3292. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive cashier's checks of certain banking institutions in payment for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3293. A bill to provide that the pension, compensation, or retirement pay of veterans of the War with Spain shall not be reduced during hospitalization or receipt of institutional or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 3294. A bill concerning seeing-eye dogs on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3295. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3303. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3304. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3305. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3306. A bill to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 304. Resolution for the consideration of S. 1242, an act to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3296. A bill for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3297. A bill for the relief of the alien, Dimitrios Pantelakis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3298. A bill for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis and Nicholas Kavalakis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 3302. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2372. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Melville J. Deininger and 39 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2373. Also, petition of 98 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging early consideration and a favorable vote on House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2374. Also, petition of Rowland Zimmerman and 21 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against consideration of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2375. Also, petition of Frank A. Woll and 22 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2376. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of John Joyce and 19 other citizens of Fulton and Montgomery Counties, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2377. Also, petition of Oscar Grosse, of Northville, N. Y., and 20 other citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2378. Also, petition of Leonard C. Gaylord and 20 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2379. Also, petition of Joseph Slezak and 115 other citizens of the United States, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2380. Also, petition of Francis W. Russ and 19 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2381. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Kiowa, Kans., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2382. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Greensburg, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2383. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of M. L. Whitsel and 324 citizens of Farmington, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2384. Also, petition of Ethel McClees and 41 citizens of Kelso, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2385. Also, petition of Walter Thomas and 113 citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manu-

facture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2386. Also, petition of Mabel M. Shrum and 20 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2387. Also, petition of Myrtle E. Narner and 373 citizens of Olean, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2388. Also, petition of Ray W. Denning and 208 citizens of Dowagiac, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2389. Also, petition of Delta Rundie and 102 citizens of Colchester, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2390. Also, petition of Alice D. Schwdt and 436 citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2391. Also, petition of W. G. Ferguson and 62 citizens of Afton, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2392. Also, petition of Mrs. George Priel and 67 citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2393. Also, petition of Mrs. Perry Sand and 146 citizens of Geneseo, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2394. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 302, Zanesville, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2395. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2396. Also, petition of the members of Muskingum Presbyterian Church, Muskingum County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2397. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2398. Also, petition of various citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2399. Also, petition of sundry residents of Zanesville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2400. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Mary Hagene and 16 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2401. Also, petition of Harry Troll and 41 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2402. Also, petition of Mary Jacob and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2403. Also, petition of S. M. Tiffin and S. C. Thomson of the Federated Metals Corporation, signed by 68 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2404. Also, petition of Louise Nerleth and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2405. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Grupe and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2406. Also, petition of Mrs. R. Huskey and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2407. Also, petition of the Schlueter Manufacturing Co., signed by 46 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2408. Also, petition of the American Builders Supply Co., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2409. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Mrs. Roy O. Yeatts, of Chehalis, Wash., and 48 citizens of Lewis County, vicinity of Onalaska,

Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2410. Also, petition of Mrs. Albert Dodds, of Olympia, Wash., and 19 citizens of Olympia, Wash., and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2411. Also, petition of F. M. Buckley, of Ridgefield, Wash., and 12 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2412. Also, petition of Harry Aubol, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 23 citizens of Aberdeen and Cosmopolis, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2413. Also, petition of Bernice Baker, Vancouver, Wash., and 10 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2414. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Myrtle M. Kimmel and 27 other citizens of Oskaloosa and McLouth, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, regarding the transportation and use of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2415. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of sundry citizens of Champaign, Urbana, and Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2416. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2417. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Arcola, Filson, and Hindsboro, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2418. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sidney, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2419. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rantoul, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2420. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pratt, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2421. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2422. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2423. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of A. E. Gasber and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2424. Also, petition of numerous patrons of Franke's confectionery, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2425. Also, petition of numerous patrons of Michael J. Kostolich riverside confectionery, of Benwood, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2426. Also, petition of members of American Legion Post, No. 5, McMechen, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2427. Also, petition of Mrs. Arthur Neiderheiser, president, the Ruth Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Weirton and Hollidays Cove, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2428. Also, petition of Frank Miller and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2429. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of F. M. Schmidt and other residents of the Third Congressional District of Iowa, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2430. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Anthony, Kans., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2431. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of 3,055 citizens of the city of Evansville, Ind., calling upon the Congress to give full support to the following program as an essential part of the war program: (1) A rollback of prices to levels of September 15, 1942; (2) grade labeling of all packaged food products to assure consumers recognized quality at appropriate prices; (3) subsidies for small producers (including farmers) to enable them to produce more without increasing costs to the consumer; (4) dollar-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items; (5) complete rent control; (6) strict enforcement of all price ceilings by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2432. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of 38 residents of Hawarden, Iowa, and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2433. Also, petition of 22 residents of O'Brien County, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2434. Also, of 46 residents of Cleghorn and Cherokee, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2435. Also, petition of 103 citizens of Smithland, Oto, and Ute, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2436. Also, petition of 82 residents of Sioux City, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill

2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2437. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of a number of residents of Brooklyn and Queens, concerning the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2438. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Mrs. R. G. Putnam and signed by 40 representative citizens of Hamilton County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2439. Also a communication from L. T. De Fur, of Shawneetown, Ill., enclosing newspaper clipping in opposition to the Austin-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2440. Also, petition presented by Mr. and Mrs. R. G. Putnam, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by themselves and 46 representative citizens of Eldorado and vicinity, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2441. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Propeller Club of the port of Portland, Maine, endorsing the passage of House bill 2314, legislation for the purpose of adjusting the inequalities to the personnel of the former Lighthouse Service, and opposing passage of Senate bill 1173 and House bill 2972, or similar legislation providing suspension of certain provisions of the Public Vessels Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2442. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry citizens of Clear Lake, Iowa, supporting measures to further regulate the sale of intoxicating liquor around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2443. By Mr. HERTER: Petition signed by sundry residents of Massachusetts, opposing legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on or near military reservations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2444. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Reverend Rollins and others of Ava and Douglas County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2445. Also, petition of Margaret Johnson of Mount Vernon and Lawrence County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2446. Also, petition of G. B. Cornelius and others of Carthage and Jasper Counties, Mo., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2447. Also, petition of W. P. Clements and others of Taney County, Mo., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2448. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry residents of Waterloo, Iowa, supporting House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2449. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Rev. James Kelly and 230 members of the Methodist Church of Shippensburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2450. Also, petition of P. L. Grier and 52 citizens of Charlotte, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2451. Also, petition of Rev. R. Mills Gray and 80 citizens of Corning, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2452. Also, petition of Alice D. Schwdt and 70 citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2453. Also, petition of Rev. W. Harold Shaw and 215 members of the First Methodist Church of Fredonia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2454. Also, petition of Myrtle E. Cato and 127 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2455. Also, petition of Maud Hamilton and 150 citizens of Clearfield, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2456. Also, petition of Lora Shasteen and 272 citizens of Sullivan, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2457. Also, petition of Mrs. W. B. Houser and 60 citizens of Hollywood, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for

the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2458. Also, petition of H. W. Reinecke and 76 citizens of West Liberty, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2459. Also, petition of Dr. A. A. Swanson and 62 citizens of Espyville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2460. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Burlingame and 50 citizens of Cincinnati, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2461. By Mr. BUSBEY: Petitions of Barbara Balls, William F. Stoecker, Mike Jaszczak, William Wassong, William B. O'Connell, Frank J. Weber, and other citizens of the Third Illinois District, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war, and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2462. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Grinnell, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2463. By Mr. DAY: Petition of the Republican Nationalist Revival Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2464. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of Mrs. Mark Winchester and 88 residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2465. Also, petition of Rosella C. Stone and other residents of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2466. Also, petition of Joanne Helnold and other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2467. Also, petition of Hon. Lulu T. Gleason and other residents of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2468. Also, petition of Mrs. F. H. Merrell and 29 other residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war, sponsored by Hon. JOSEPH

R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2469. By Mr. MCCORMACK: Petition of James E. Barsi, manager, August A. Busch & Co., of Massachusetts, Inc., 222 Arsenal Street, Watertown, Mass., and sundry others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2470. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mrs. Leo A. Mons and others urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2471. Also, petition of Arthur L. Hart and others, urging the adoption of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2472. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Yellowstone Basin Association, Billings, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Yellowstone River Valley Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2473. Also, petition of Alamo and San Antonio National Farm Loan Association, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 50; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2474. Also, petition of the Moorish Science Temple, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the great work which the Moorish Divine and National Movement of North America is doing for the benefit of fallen humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. Also, petition of the city of Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to utilization of the National Youth Administration material; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Lord and Saviour, in Thee we have a refuge in every time of need. When temptation is nigh and human courage is at the test, Thou art near; when problems perplex and the way is uncertain, Thou dost help us to understand; when the sight is dim and the clouds low, we may be unquestionably sure that we are not alone. In unutterable quiet and as tranquil as sunlight, Thou dost lift the trusting soul beyond the clutch of circumstances.

O God, enlarge the sense of our wonderful privilege and lead us to break through all barriers of misunderstanding and prejudice, giving stimulus to all that is great and good in the being of man. How tremendous is our mission and how noble is our calling; O give us those requisite qualities of strength that will keep us true to the tasks entrusted to us. Bless and qualify us for the very best which lies before us; consider our infirmities and grant us the sweetening grace of Thy forbearance. We pray that we may never lose heaven out of our hearts, but hold us in harmony with Thy holy will and in tune with that music which will resound and reecho forever. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article from the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a resolution passed by the American Legion of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therewith a speech delivered recently by our distinguished Governor, John W. Bricker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include some newspaper and magazine clippings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INSURANCE FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH] addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a speech by Mr. W. M. Carney, chief chemist of the Lion Oil Refining Co. on the subject The Possibilities for Chemical Development of Our Natural Gas and Petroleum.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address by Mr. James P. Pope, a director of T. V. A., before the meeting of the Cherokee County Farm Bureau at Center, Ala., on August 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, an article from a Washington paper, and a letter answering an inquiry that came to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VICTORY GARDEN BEANS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about an agricultural accomplishment which is unique, coming from the great industrial State of Pennsylvania, with its 11,000,000 people, with over a million men in the armed forces of the United States, producing today over 30 percent of all the war materials.

We are also making an amazing contribution to increase the food supply of the Nation in the Victory-garden program. I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] talk about cheese, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] talk about cattle, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] talk about wheat, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] talk about the tall corn, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] talk about peanuts, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] talk about climate, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] talk about the Irish; and so I want to take this opportunity to say that along with the great industrial accomplishments of my State, our farmers have something to talk about. I produce for you herewith a string bean grown by Win Smathers, of Clarion, Pa., in my district, one of the smaller beans off his vines, which is 41 inches long, weighing 7 pounds, and grown in 6 weeks.

This will give the farm State Representatives something to gasp about. I defy any Member of the House to produce from his district a string bean of this gigantic, monumental size and beauty. It proves to the Members of the House that when Pennsylvania goes all out for production for the war effort, whether mechanized equipment or food-stuffs, we get results.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is not inferring, is he, that he is a "has bean"?